



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

HD WIDENER



HW K99E F

9. 26. 31

Dogmat. Theol.
Episcop.



To the Editor of the
"North American Review"
with the respects
of the
Author

London Nov 1847

FREE THOUGHTS

ON

PROTESTANT MATTERS,

IN ONE VOLUME,

Freshum James

BY THE REV. T. D. GREGG, M.A.,

CHAPLAIN OF ST. NICHOLAS WITHIN, DUBLIN.

SECOND EDITION.

DUBLIN:

W. CURRY, JUN., & CO., AND S. B. OLDHAM.

LONDON:

RICHARD GROOMBRIDGE AND SONS

1847.

~~1912.110.8~~

C1219.26.31

✓

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY

1850 March 20

Gift of

Francis Bowdoin

Cambridge

TO
BENJAMIN DISRAELI, ESQ., M.P.,

THIS VOLUME IS INSCRIBED,

AS A

TESTIMONY OF ADMIRATION AND GRATITUDE

FOR HIS TRIUMPHANT EXPOSURE OF THE APOSTATE MINISTER,

WHO, IN PREFERRING

A BASE EXPEDIENCY TO SACRED PRINCIPLE,

HAS NOT ONLY BETRAYED THE CAUSE OF TRUTH,

BUT GIVEN A SHOCK TO PUBLIC MORALITY,

BY WHICH ALL CONFIDENCE IN THE PROFESSIONS

OF PUBLIC MEN

IS WELL NIGH OVERTHROWN,

AND ALSO

IN THE HOPE THAT HIS GREAT POWERS,

DIRECTED TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THOSE SOUND PRINCIPLES

WHICH THE CONSTITUTION IN CHURCH AND STATE INVOLVES,

WHICH HAVE NEVER YET BEEN CARRIED OUT,

AND WHICH ARE HERE,

HOWEVER FEEBLY,

ILLUSTRATED, RECOMMENDED, AND ENFORCED,

MAY TEND

TO AVERT IMPENDING RUIN,

AND GUARANTEE, AT THE SAME TIME,

THE INTEGRITY OF THE EMPIRE,

THE SAFETY OF THE CROWN,

AND THE WELL-BEING AND HAPPINESS

OF THE PEOPLE.

PREFACE.

It is with no small satisfaction and gratitude, too, that the Author should be called upon here to put it on record, that after an impression of twelve hundred had been disposed of, a second edition of his work was called for within the year of its appearance. He trusts that he may regard the circumstance as indicative of the interest taken in the subjects discussed, and thence entertain a good hope that the views which he has set forth may ultimately be realized. For the accomplishment of this object he has long felt himself bound by the duty which he owes to God and to his country, in every possible way which seemed to him legitimate, to struggle.

He is well aware that many are disposed to believe that the alteration in the British Constitution, caused by the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, and the Bill of 1829, whereby Roman Catholics, and Dissenters from the Church of all sorts, have been admitted to a participation in the government of the realm, renders it totally vain to expect the adoption of a policy by the State which may involve the ascendancy of the Established Church.

There can be no manner of doubt that the measures alluded to are calculated to enhance the difficulty of procuring the adoption of any such policy. This, however, does not alter the nature of the great political problem which presses for solution; which is just this—how is the vast accumulation of social evils which afflicts the whole community, to be remedied? and, more especially, how

is Ireland to be raised from the depth of misery in which she is plunged? Of this problem the Author has submitted his solution. If that solution be a correct one, it at once points out the line of conduct in which, at least, all the members of the United Church of England and Ireland should proceed. These constitute the vast majority of the subjects of the crown, and it is unquestionable that if they were unitedly to devote themselves to the realization of those views which are suggested in this work, it is competent to them to remove everything in the shape of difficulty which might interpose against them. Let it not be said that there is deficiency of spirit amongst churchmen, and that it is this which disqualifies them from grappling with and overcoming the evil of the times. The Author can state, from personal experience, that this is not the case. Recent opportunities of observation, taken in connexion with the experience of the English character, which a residence in England long ago afforded him, has deepened the conviction, that anything and everything that is great and good, may be expected from English churchmen properly animated. The wisdom, the talent, the energy, the devotedness, latent in the breasts of the children of the church, are utterly incalculable. The Author confesses an allusion; but exalted as his admiration is, he feels that the retiring character of excellence would forbid his being explicit. To appeal to English churchmen in the proper way is the sole requisite to success. When that appeal is made, down go simultaneously the Popery of Ireland, the religious indifference of England, and the misery of both countries. The Author ventures to submit that the huge spirit of antagonism by which the church is, and has been, so

long encountered on the part of the various denominations of Protestant Dissenters, has grown out of the neglect, by the church herself, of those very duties which he has here urged the performance of. It is little wonderful that hosts should be found rising up to clamour against the union of Church and State, when that union heretofore has scarcely served any other purpose than to enable the State to corrupt the Church, and the Church to neglect the obligations which she owes to the people. The reader is particularly intreated to direct his attention to those parts of the work which treat of the divisions of the Protestant world, and the mode of healing them. If he do not agree with the Author in the conclusion, that the adoption of the means laid down therein for making all those who agree in vital principle in fact and in truth one with the Church herself, the Author will be obliged to confess that he has failed in producing that conviction in the minds of others which is deeply, and he thinks, on solid grounds, impressed upon his own.

In fact, whatever may have been the changes heretofore made in the British Constitution, they have not altered the important reality that the State does still profess the principles of the Church. Of that Church, to adopt the language of an Act of Parliament, "the *doctrine* and discipline are established by law," (see the 10 Geo. IV., c. 7,) and accordingly, however much the superstructure of the Constitution may have been altered, its fundamental principle has been left untouched. Consistency demands either the total abandonment by the State of the principles of the Church and the utter separation of the two corporations—or else the full and complete development of the idea which their union implies. The Anti-State-Church people are quite

consistent in demanding the dissolution of the union ; and surely if this be so, State-Church people are warranted to demand the full development of its principle, and they are imperatively called upon to do so when it is the neglect of that development which creates the revolutionary movement by which all that they hold dear is assailed. It is monstrous to expect that the community should rest easy under the perpetuation of a mismanagement, to say the least of it, which no one can have the hardihood to defend. If the Church, in the fulfilment of all her functions, were opposed as she is, there would be very serious reason for thinking that she was altogether indefensible ; but when every one may see that it is in the neglect of perhaps the highest of those functions she encounters the hostility by which she is met, we have something like a warrant for the conclusion that that hostility has been elicited by the abuses of her system, rather than by the system itself. Common sense demands that the nation should do one thing or the other ; either separate Church and State, or work them properly. Every true friend of the Church believes that she is quite competent to stand alone. If she be the true Church, it is quite certain that if left to herself, she must flourish. Let the union between the Church and the State be dissolved. Let the Church have the untrammelled choice of her own ministry. Let the foreign influence that leads to the promotion of weak or worthless men be abolished. Let her be governed by a sense of what she owes to herself and the world ; and thus induced to avail herself of the rare gifts of mind and of heart—piety, wisdom, learning, and power, with which God has so abundantly enriched her, and soon will she constitute a moral host to which everything would give way. She would draw the whole nation within her

borders. And, if so, what then? Why, then she would herself create governments, and creating governments control legislation, and, if the union between Church and State be legitimate, re-establish that union for the express purpose of rendering the State auxiliary to the promotion of her influence, and to the spread of the truth which she proclaims. This process would involve the transit of the realm through a most painful stage; through a condition of religious anarchy and confusion, accompanied with, as can scarcely be doubted, political revolution.

The Anti-State Church people would Americanise the United Kingdom. Can it be possible that the members of the church should be so sunk in apathy, as to look on while this is being done, and to be incapable of being stirred to legitimate action by anything short of that extremity of evil which is certain to grow out of their neglect? Rather than build upon a foundation already laid, and complete a work consecrated, as to its origin and progress, by recollections of the most glorious kind, will they wait until the foundations are cast down, as it were, for the express purpose of commencing *de novo*, and amid difficulties which now have no existence? The church, by the blessing of the Almighty on her, emerged from the thick darkness of the Popish corruption. By the strength of his Almighty arm she was restored, when prostrated by schismatical disaffection. Will churchmen allow her again to fall beneath the onslaught of infidelity, in order that she may prove that, even then, she could rise again, rather than put forth the exertion that would prevent so great an amount of evil, and not from the pressure of circumstances, but from a sense of sacred duty, make her what she ought to be? Let us hope not. The time for exertion has come. Unless he be totally wrong in his conclusions

the Author has here pointed out the path in which the exertion should be made, and which would certainly lead to a triumphant issue. Let us then gird up our loins for the occasion, and run the race that is set before us, looking unto the Author and Finisher of our faith. Let us play the man for the church of our God, and for the welfare of our brethren, and show that enthusiasm is possible in a more noble cause than that of error and Apostasy, and for a more gracious Master than the Mammon of unrighteousness.

The Author is deeply impressed with the conviction that he owes it to the success of this humble attempt that he should deprecate the severity of criticism. He wrote this book originally in furtherance of active efforts, practically made on the platform of an Association which contemplates the effectuation of the objects which are here proposed—for the perusal of plain and earnest men,—and published it in the serial form, as well because that form demanded less of immediate expenditure, as from the conviction that his thoughts would thus be more telling in their effect. Those familiar with the serial form of publication will be aware that it naturally induces a desultory mode of treating a subject. Each part that is issued requires to have in it something calculated to excite the feeling, and thus maintain the interest which may lead readers to persevere as purchasers; and this, in such a work as the present, is likely to imbue the subjects as they rise with something of the nature of passing events. It is, to a great extent, adverse to any very continuous argumentation. While some may suppose that this is inconsistent with that more weighty sort of demonstration which might emanate from the study of a grave teacher of ethics, others may, perhaps, be disposed to admit that it is, after all, not inconsistent, but rather the contrary, with the produc-

tion of energetic effects and ultimate success. The truth seems to be, after all, that it is not so much the demonstrations of the philosopher which form public opinion, and make it influential for great purposes, as those more simple reasons which grow out of the observation of current events, when viewed in the light of some sound and unquestionable principle.

A chapter of important truth may be read in every important occurrence if it be only wisely considered. Providence, after all, is the great preacher. Public opinion raises up one and puts down another; takes the beggar from the dunghill, and sets him among princes, and again sends the rich empty away. And what is it which forms that public opinion? Events, regulated by the controlling hand of Him who governs all things amongst the armies of heaven and amongst the children of men. The present work consists rather of a series of rapid blows in the same direction than of methodical disquisition. Should the critic object to this, —while, perhaps, the Author as a writer, would plead guilty to his animadversions, he would be disposed as a practical man, not indeed to assert the superior wisdom of the course that he has followed, but to submit that, after all, that course may have been wise.

When the work was being issued, Sir Robert Peel and his Ministry were in power. It will be seen that this accounts for much of the observations made, and for the peculiarity of the language employed. Since, however, this did not interfere with the essential treatment of the subject proposed, but merely modified it in circumstantialities, it has not been thought necessary to make any alteration, now that the great delinquent is put *hors de combat*.

It is distinctly avowed that the Author intended, as far as possible, to bring about a state of public feeling which should deliver the

realm from the infatuated workings of the late unprincipled Prime Minister. This object he contemplated as his work progressed, nor did he confine himself to its "four corners" in order to bring it about. He used the influence which his position in the Protestant Association of Dublin afforded him with the same view. He penned a letter, as the organ of that Association, to an able and distinguished Member of Parliament, which induced an answer, brief but pithy, declaring that "Peel was the greatest traitor since the days of Judas Iscariot!" This letter went the round of the press, and did its work. He met Mr. O'Connell at a great meeting of the citizens of Dublin, convened at the Royal Exchange, just at the crisis when the Maynooth Grant treason got wind, and, opposed as he was to the great agitator, they cordially agreed as to the infamous inconsistency of Peel, which even Roman Catholics laughed to scorn; and proclaimed that inconsistency amid the irrepressible groans of two thousand Protestants and Roman Catholics of the Irish metropolis, accordant, perhaps, on this subject alone. He penned a petition to Parliament, denouncing the unconstitutional conduct of the Member for Tamworth, and calling for his impeachment—a petition which, whatever may have been its merits or demerits, at least attracted the attention of the United Kingdom, and is now printed in the archives of the Legislature. It will be a testimony in time to come, that the Protestant masses of the Irish metropolis were not parties to the traitorism under which the United Kingdom is but too likely to groan—a truth which should not be sent abroad without the gratifying statement, that there was a noble-hearted senator to stand by the petitioners, and with matchless tact and ability to bring forward their views, and urge them upon the attention of the British Parliament. The

meeting in which this petition was adopted was announced by placards of the largest dimensions, posted all over the Irish metropolis, and summoning Irish Protestants to demand at the hands of those in authority "the impeachment of Sir R. Peel." Beside all this, the author took a leading part in the convocation of countless meetings, in which the indignation of the community was loudly manifested against the betrayer of the church. He has given nothing like an enumeration of the active steps which he took in the same direction, and which were calculated, as many thought, to issue in expelling from power one who seemed to hold but to abuse it. The argument, *post hoc, ergo propter hoc*, is anything but a sound one. And here it would be ridiculous to think of imagining its applicability. In such a work as the riddance of the country from a corrupt and an unprincipled Minister, countless instrumentalities are necessary, and are brought into operation. The Author only performed his part, and a very humble one it was, amongst thousands of others. However, Peel has sunk, we may hope never, at least politically, to rise again. Let our worst wish towards him be, that the leisure which he enjoys may afford him opportunity for repentance, and that the deplorable example of his fall may prove a warning to all future statesmen.

The Author finds it impossible to conclude without admitting that, in point of style as a writer, he feels his great deficiency. He does, however, trust that he will be judged by his sentiments rather than by his mode of expressing them; and that the value of his work may be tested, not by the merits of his composition as such, but by the correctness of the views which he has endeavoured, at least honestly, to set forth.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

ALTHOUGH my book is desultory in its character, it has one main purpose

That purpose is to engage Christian Irishmen in a united effort to rescue our country from the evils that afflict it.

This is my purpose.

I show that it is practicable, and that its effectuation would involve the elevation of the British empire to the highest pitch of happiness and prosperity.

For I exhibit Christian legislation as accomplishing the conversion of Ireland, and a legislature that would carry such legislation into effect, must, to be consistent, make it universal.

General legislation of a Christian character, would equally bless the United Kingdom and the empire.

The evils of society spring from the prevalence of unsound moral and social principles ; that is, from false religion.

At the head of all false religions stands Popery. I show how to eradicate it.

The instrumentality for eradicating Popery is the Reformed Church. I show how to heal its divisions : to make it "terrible as an army with banners."

In the course of my demonstrations I explode some injurious fallacies, and bring into prominence some facts, the knowledge of which may be necessary to the due influence of what I say upon the minds of my readers.

I trust that, if, in digressions having this object in view, I have been too elaborate, I may be excused.

I fear that my objections may have taken so wide a range that they will alienate from my side many whose co-operation I would earnestly covet. I can only say, in self-defence, that I very

reluctantly object, when I do object ; and that I should abstain from objection, did I not consider the assertion of truth imperatively demanded by the interests of my country and of the Church ; and that I should be betraying those interests did I allow private considerations to withhold me from a full expression of those sentiments which I believe to be sound.

I am extremely anxious to produce practical effects upon three classes.

First and foremost, Upon the industrious classes of Protestants—the mass, the multitude, the people. Whatever they are convinced of, if it be correct, becomes ultimately public opinion.

Secondly, Upon the Protestant Clergy and the religious Aristocracy. And,

Thirdly, Upon thinking Englishmen.

I consider it of vast importance to bring Englishmen of influence to understand that the Protestants of Ireland are the pilot power of the State. English Protestants are too far removed from the evil to be likely to be, in the first instance, stirred up to place themselves in the foremost ranks of a great moral warfare.

The English statesman who was enthroned in the affections and wielded the energies of Irish Protestants would be invincible. He alone would properly understand and properly deal with the great political bugbear of the day, Irish Popery. May God, in his infinite mercy, raise us up men suited to the times !

Let it never be forgotten, that the Almighty represents as his chief prerogative the creation and the annihilation of great characters. “ Behold, the Lord, the Lord of Hosts, doth take away from Jerusalem, and from Judah, the stay and the staff. The mighty man and the man of war, the judge, and the prophet, and the prudent, the ancient ; the captain of fifty and the honourable man, and the counsellor, and the cunning artificer, and the eloquent orator. And I will give children to be their princes, and babes shall rule over them.” (Isaiah iii. 1—4.) And, again, “ I will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy counsellors as at the beginning.” (Isaiah ii. 26.) Who raised up Moses, David, Samuel, Gideon, Sampson, Wickliffe, Luther, Cranmer, William the Third, of glorious, pious, and immortal memory ?

God did. "There is no power but of God." "The shields of the earth belong unto the Lord."

When will we begin to recollect that these are the great practical truths in politics; that faith enables us to wield the hand that wields the universe, and, therefore, to concentrate our energies, first upon earnest endeavours to secure the DIVINE favour; and, secondly, to lead mankind to the belief that this is the one thing needful?

CONTENTS.

PART I.

CHAP. I.—INTRODUCTION	1
II.—PERSONAL OBJECTIONS MET	7
III.—IS POPERY ENSLAVING AND DEGRADING? HAS THE TIME COME FOR ITS OVERTHROW IN IRELAND? A BEAM OF HOPE	26
IV.—INTERFERENCE IN POLITICS A PRIME CHRISTIAN DUTY	39
V.—THE INFATUATION OF 1829 ILLUSTRATED, OF 1845 PROVED. INTERFERENCE IN POLITICS A SACRED OBLIGATION	65
VI.—INTERFERENCE IN POLITICS A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT. WISDOM OF THE DUKE OF WELLING- TON—HIS FOLLY	83
VII.—PROTESTANTISM AND LIBERTY MUST AVAIL THEM- SELVES OF THAT POPULAR INFLUENCE WHICH POPERY AND SLAVERY ARE ENDEAVOURING TO PROFIT BY	101
VIII.—CONCLUSION	119

PART II.

CHAP. I.—THE ANGLICAN AND ROMAN SYSTEMS DIFFER IN ESSENTIALS	123
II.—THE SYSTEM OF THE REV. R. J. M'GHEE	148
III.—ESSENTIAL IMPORTANCE, AT THE PRESENT CRISIS, OF EARNESTNESS IN RELIGION	168
IV.—MARKS OF THE TRUE CHURCH	181
V.—THE ANGLICAN CHURCH HAS THE MARKS OF A TRUE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. FIRST, APOSTOLICAL DOCTRINE	188

VI.—THE ANGLICAN CHURCH HAS THE MARKS OF A TRUE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. SECONDLY, APO- STOLICAL CONNEXION	193
VII.—APOSTOLIC TRUTH—APOSTOLIC ORDER	221
VIII.—THE STATUS OF THE CHURCH OF ROME	227
IX.—THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED	246
X.—THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED—OBJECTIONS— DR. TODD AND HIS SCHOOL	258
XI.—DR. TODD KNOWINGLY SET HIMSELF AGAINST THE VIEWS OF HIS CHURCH	274
XII.—DR. O'SULLIVAN'S SYSTEM—THE EPOCH OF THE APOSTASY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME	289

PART III.

CHAP. I.—THE DUTY OF LABOURING FOR THE CONVERSION OF IRELAND	296
II.—A VIEW OF THE DIVISIONS OF THE CHRISTIAN WORLD	313
III.—OUR DIVISIONS—I. EXTRINSIC TO THE CHURCH; II. INTRINSIC.—EXTRINSIC DIVISIONS, THEIR ORIGIN TWOFOLD	326
IV.—DIVISIONS EXTRINSIC TO THE CHURCH, GROW OUT OF WANT OF LIBERTY AND POWER IN IT	343
V.—CHRISTIAN UNION TO BE PROSECUTED BY MAKING MANIFEST THE SUPERIOR CLAIMS OF THE CHURCH CATHOLIC	360
VI.—OUR DIVISIONS—II. INTRINSIC. THEIR CAUSES AND REMEDIES	364
VII.—WHAT IS TO BE DONE—THE DEVELOPMENT OF OUR PRINCIPLE	381
VIII.—THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED—RESULTS	392
IX.—THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED—MEASURES OF REFORM	400
X.—CONCLUSION	409
APPENDIX	419
NOTES	438

FREE THOUGHTS ON PROTESTANT MATTERS.

PART I.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

After I had determined on the present work, I began to question the judiciousness of the title which I designed for it. There is a sense of the word in which I am far from an admirer of "free thoughts." "Free thoughts" are the plague of the times. Your theological gentry, who manufacture moral systems out of their own brains, led all through merely by circumstances and their own independent reasonings about them, have turned the world topsy-turvy. There is nothing, however absurd, that "free thinkers" cannot persuade themselves to the soundness of. There is no extravagance, however wild; no figment, however ridiculous; no theory, however unfounded, (I mean in moral matters,) that the mind of man when unenlightened by Divine Wisdom, and in that respect untrammelled, may not cordially embrace, and believe itself constrained by reason to labour for the propagation of. Being very far, therefore, from being a free-thinker, I felt a sort of scruple about entitling a work of mine, "Free Thoughts."

Moreover, I began to reflect that I did not mean to confine myself to the sole consideration of "*Protestant Matters*." I intended to discuss, in general, everything that concerned Ireland; at least, not to confine my consideration to any particular department of the affairs of the country. From these two considerations combined, it therefore struck me, that had I resolved on entitling my book, "*Protestant Thoughts on Irish Matters*," that title would more precisely express its nature and design. Upon a little further reflection, however, I perceived that this title involved the idea of a limit, by which I by no means intended that I should be confined. The end of my "Thoughts" is, undoubtedly, Ireland. My desire is, to advance the interests of our native land; but there are many considerations that are quite general in their character; nay, there may be considerations connected with localities totally different from Ireland, which may have an important

bearing upon the end that I have in view. Thoughts about England, France, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Germany, or the Americas; thoughts, generally, about Popery, Protestantism, Tractarianism, or any other *ism*; about free trade, or corn laws; about the condition of the working classes and the poor, and the various remedies proposed for their amelioration—all these it may become necessary to my plan that I should develope. It therefore struck me, that "Protestant Thoughts on *General Matters*," would more appropriately mark the purpose of my volume than either the title which I originally designed for it, or that which I have just suggested; whilst at the same time it would signify, that I did not come forward to add myself to the multitude of system-mongers and system-makers already in existence; but that I held myself to be regulated in all my thoughts by those standards of Protestant orthodoxy which regulate the opinions of churchmen.

There was, however, an objection to the last-named title also. It seemed to be wide of a purpose. I want to fight, not as those that beat the air: we have real evils to contend with; we have a vast number of real dunder-headed blockheads, some of them well meaning enough, and a vast number of real dark-plodding Jesuits, many of them by far too able, who, by their conjoint efficacy,—though they by no means work together, and have far different ends in view,—heap upon the Protestant cause division, disaster, and overthrow; and I was afraid, that if I announced myself as about to talk about "General Matters," it would be at once concluded that my work was idle, and my views moonshine. In order, therefore, to guard against so fatal a mistake, it struck me, that I might qualify the last-named title so as to make it suit.

The public are sick, and justly sick, of mere theorists. There are a thousand things that might benefit society, which, either from being impracticable or from some equally valid cause, it would be sheer insanity to urge or to contend for. To illustrate; suppose it were argued that there are large portions of the public parks—the Phoenix Park, for instance, to take an example understood by us all—which might be assigned, as garden plots, to the industrious poor, and that this might be done without militating against the general purpose for which these parks are now reserved; or suppose it were argued, that a large quantity of the Queen's plate might be disposed of, and supplied by other equally serviceable and brilliant, with great benefit to the nation, and without any diminution of happiness to her majesty; who is there that would not at once pronounce the proposers of such schemes as little better than madmen? A measure of the same sort of insanity belongs to every projector whose schemes, however plausible they may be in theory, or however beneficial they propose to be in result, are justly chargeable with the fault of impracticability. There is no one in the world who has a keener sense of the absurdity of impracticable schemes than myself, or who is less disposed to "general" considerations, which, after all, can terminate in nothing.

But what is practicability? What renders a scheme impracticable? And when is it entitled to rank as practicable?

Practicability is a variable thing; it alters with times and seasons, with places, circumstances, and prevailing principles. That might be practicable in America, which would be utterly impracticable in our own country; that might be practicable among Papists, which would be quite the reverse in a Protestant community; and *vice versa*. What, then, is practicable, and what not? I answer, nothing is impracticable amongst a Protestant people, which can be supported by right reason and sound scriptural sentiment, provided it be of such a character as that good and wise men may be found to lay down their lives for its obtainment. However multitudes may be opposed, cabinets hostile, parliaments unwilling, and monarchs pledged, if there be an object that is right in the sight of God, and such as that good men may, for I will repeat the expression, lay down their lives to obtain it—when they are come to the pitch of decision to do so, then their object may be looked for; the conditions which I have supposed, render it attainable.

If, on the other hand, there be an object which cannot be supported by sound argument derived from reason and religion, to which opposing multitudes are adverse, and for which it would be madness to sacrifice human life, then, if the opponents of such an object be only properly informed, disposed, and animated, that object may be pronounced impracticable.

The Repeal of the Union might be an impracticability. What is it? What does the demand for it imply? What do those who seek for it want? They want to have an arrangement made which is merely conventional, a mere matter of agreement between two parties. The thing involves no principle of a moral or religious sort—nothing, in order to obtain which it would not be folly, madness, and fatuity, to rush into the presence of God. It would be just as mad to die for repeal, as it would be to die in order to have the Phoenix Park cut up into potato plots, or the queen compelled to eat her dinner off plated ware. Mark! I only say, repeal *might* be impracticable. The madness and the folly of Wellington and Peel, and the base unfaithfulness of the English people, may render the scheme,—wild as it is, and abhorrent to British prejudices,—not merely practicable, but inevitable. The *Nation* roars out for the national independence of Ireland. It writes its powerful sentences, and indites its stirring stanzas, and they stir up—whom? the children—the imbeciles, the god of whose idolatry is the green sod of their native land—"Young Ireland." They kindle these young men into an enthusiasm of "nationality," into a flame of "patriotism;" the source and origin of which are pride, selfishness, international hatred, ignorance of God, and indifference to eternity. But, still, it is fire, enthusiasm—it is a spirit which in every age of the world has accomplished mighty things. And what does dastard, truce-breaking, cowardly, truckling, gold-worshipping, earth-worm Peel? What does he do? What does he oppose to the "nationality" that inspires these

enthusiastic Irishmen? Why, he opposes it to the sordid cupidity, the equally selfish love of national supremacy for mammon sake, and for vain glory sake, which fills the English heart; and, because he has well-constructed battalions, well-furnished arsenals, and a long array of past victories to exhibit and to make a boast of; because he has well-stored magazines, and a well-supplied exchequer; because of all this, mind, and in a manner totally irrespective of every religious consideration,—the only consideration on account of which, I firmly believe, Britain ever fired one successful shot on the Irish soil—I repeat, irrespectively of God and of religion, and inflated with a pride that is as much more contemptible than that of “Young Ireland,” as the love of gold and tyranny is more contemptible than the love of country and of liberty; he says, “I will pursue, I will overtake, I will divide the spoil!” If an encounter take place between the Irish and the English nations, thus respectively animated—one seeking for the Repeal of the Union, and the other determined not to concede it—what should be expected but indelible disgrace to the British arms, frustration of British hopes, and humiliation to the British name? God is “the Lord of Hosts,” “the battle is the Lord’s.” And when England has, at the instigation of traitor Peel, surrendered every claim to Ireland as a field wherein to spread Gospel truth, and conceded supremacy within her borders to foul idolatry, upon the simple hope that that idolatry should submit to British sway, it will be little wonder if the God of battles should smite ungodly Britain upon the hinder parts, and put her to a perpetual shame.

If, on the other hand, the British ministry, in standing against the Repealers, had their feet upon the rock of truth; if their principle were that which was expressed by the motto of the great and good King William, “*Je maintien le vrai*”—“I maintain the truth;” if such a sentiment as “the Protestant religion, and the liberties of Ireland,” as in the case of that right Royal King of glorious memory, were inscribed on the banner which they unfurled in the face of the Irish nation; if the spirit of their policy were freedom from the thralldom of priestcraft, freedom from the trammels of degrading error, deliverance from the chains of debasing superstition, admission into the glorious liberty of the children of God; if they served God in England, and claimed Ireland as His inheritance; if they claimed supremacy for Protestant truth, and insisted on the abasement of Popish falsehood, then, indeed, the case would be altered—“one of them would chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight.” Repeal, in that case, would really be an impracticability, an *ignis fatuus*, a humbug,—to be sure it would. Was it not the national recognition of Popery that gave birth to the Repeal movement? Who ever dreamt of commencing such a movement previously to ’29? O’Connell, indeed, spoke of it as likely to be the result of the Emancipation Act. Far-sighted Protestant statesmen foreboded its advent as the consequence of that unprincipled concession. Reason and common sense show that it would never have come into existence, but for the moral cowardice of

Wellington and the treachery of Peel. Their fatal conduct at the epoch alluded to, has produced a state of things which as certainly involves the establishment of Popery, the accomplishment of Repeal, and the downfall of Britain through the overthrow of her church, as the opening of a hole in the bottom of a water-butt involves the waste of the contents, the emptiness of the vessel, and its uselessness so far forth as an instrument for supplying human wants.

An admitted principle in morals, will, when it is allowed to come into operation, as certainly work its results, as an admitted principle when in full operation in the physical world must.

Mark, then, the conclusion of the matter. That which can alone render Repeal impracticable, is the opposing it on strictly Protestant principles.

I may add, that the principle which I have laid down clearly shows the practicability of those objects for which I, as an individual, and those who act with me, have been contending. What is it which we contemplate?—the overthrow of Popery in Ireland. How do we look for this? Through the operation of Christian laws—laws to teach down, preach down, proclaim down, expose down, the absurdities, the figments, the lying legends, the “blasphemous fables,” and the “dangerous deceits,” which now, through the faithlessness of the State, discouraging, as it does, and discountenancing the faithfulness of the church, and appointing men to its high places, not to fight the good fight, but with the distinct understanding that they will retreat from the contest—which now, instead of being exposed and perishing, flourish, thrive, and luxuriate to the destruction of the souls of the people. This is what we look for, the overthrow of Popery in Ireland. Is it not a glorious object? Is it not a noble object? Is it not one, the reasonableness and excellency of which are demonstrable from reason and religion? What brighter crown will the court of heaven display as adorning the brows of a redeemed soul than that which will be placed upon the good and faithful servant, who, in bearing his testimony against the foul sorceress that has so long intoxicated the heart of Ireland with her enchantments, will enter into the presence of his God, washed white in the blood of the Lamb? Yes! It is a practicable object, it is a glorious object, an object worth living for, yea, and worth dying for—an object that will be effected, not by the operation of humbug and pretence, not by the workings of pride and vain glory; no, reader, the overthrow of Popery will be accomplished when multitudes of Protestants betake themselves to retirement, and open their Bibles, and determine to hold incessant communion with their God.

The Bible is a miraculous book. When read seriously and devoutly, and in due subordination to the mind of the church—wild wanderings being thus shut out, the eccentricities of individual minds thus excluded, the true sense either thus gathered or humbly waited for—it sets the heart on fire, it kindles therein a holy flame, enlightening and enlivening the individual, cheering and blessing society. When this flame glows in the bosoms of many it is irresistible, it regenerates

society, it overcomes the world. What we want for Ireland is troops ; not of military—foot, horse, or artillery ; not of police—horse, foot, or detective ; not of schoolmasters—infidel, popish, or philosophical ; but troops of enthusiasts, troops of “ fanatics,” as the world calls them—of men who will not hold their lives dear unto them so as that they may finish their course with joy. These will arise when the Bible is read incessantly. Let those, then, who wish well for Ireland do this themselves, and lead others to follow their example. Let the Protestant operative who has to go to work at six in the morning, rise at five, and spend an hour over the sacred page ; let him seize some portion of the period allotted to dinner to renew his strength ; let him drink of the healing waters as he retires to rest after the labours of the day ; let him worship in the sanctuary, and keep clear of fools ; let this be his discipline and this be his policy, and down goes Popery in Ireland.

You may rely upon it, reader, that my policy is not impracticable.

I thought, therefore, of qualifying the last-mentioned title by an addition, thus : “ Protestant Thoughts on General Matters, affecting Ireland and the Present Times ;” and it seems to me that this denomination would just express my object. It is, however, a little too long, and it wants one ingredient particularly demanded by the circumstances of the case, which the title that first struck me contains.

After the precautionary observations here made, it will, I hope, be evident, that I am for no theoretic speculations ; that I am no free-thinking disputer ; that I am far from desirous of making my individual notions a rule of right either to an individual or to multitudes ; that the business I have in hand is, not the construction of a rule, but the application of one. It is, in a word, to my thoughts as a Protestant, regulated as they are by those principles which the church promulgates as her own—it is to these I wish to call public attention. It is because they are derived from the church’s teaching, that I consider them of importance, and that I think them likely to be influential. Still, there are very particular reasons, on account of which, within the limits just set down, they should be “ free.” The cause of Protestantism in Ireland receives immense detriment in consequence of a want of *free*-spoken, plainly-delivered, simple truth. The want of this divides friends, impedes united exertion, prevents the rejection of a vast quantity of downright nonsense, and causes the existence of weakness and imbecility where there would otherwise be strength, union, and prevalent power. I wished to convey to the public that my “ Thoughts” should be of this “ free” character ; that their expression would not spare what was wrong, because there might happen to be connected with it some esteemed name, or some would-be popular character. I am quite sure that the feeling of the want which I have stated abounds in the public mind. I believe that the Protestant community is convinced that the present state of this country especially calls for straightforward simplicity and candour ; and that it is convinced, that a large measure of our evils is attributable to the delicacy

with which those evils are handled, when they are touched at all, or else to the considerate prudence which allows them to pass altogether *sub silentio*.

Upon the whole, then, I came to the conclusion to let my first idea stand. The truth is, that the necessity for *freedom of speaking* furnished the most urgent reason for which I should write at all. I myself, as an individual, was suffering various annoyances, for which I felt that the principal remedy was exposure—"free," outspoken, indignant exposure. I perceived that I was not alone in this particular; that what affected me as an individual operated to the disadvantage of multitudes, to the detriment of the Protestant cause generally; and my conclusion was, that I should not "meet the market"—the demand of the times—the sense of crying evil—if I did not put into the foreground my determination to trample upon all minor considerations, in order that Irish Protestants should hear all which it concerned Irish Protestants to know. "My title then shall be," said I, "after all, 'Free Thoughts on Protestant Matters,'—it is short, pithy, characteristic. It hints a vast deal more than it expresses; in fact, if it be understood, it is just the thing. Well, then, the history of my cogitations shall furnish the necessary explanation, and I need not make any change."

I trust, courteous reader, that these preliminary thoughts may supply you with an answer, or answers, to some few objections which may have occurred to you, and that I may, without more ado, approach the business in hand.

CHAPTER II.

PERSONAL OBJECTIONS MET.

What, then, shall first occupy my pen? I feel it in some sort humbling to say, that it must be myself. I have been for a long while before the public. I have the proud satisfaction of saying that I have a large number of friends. They have watched my proceedings, they are acquainted with my history, they know all about me; and they know this also, that I have quite an abundance of enemies. I presume that I may call by this name those who are the open, the confessed, and the decided opponents of the principles which I profess. Of course I sustain at their hands my due proportion of the hostility with which they regard every man who is an uncompromising advocate of Protestant ascendancy, and adverse to those concessions which the infidelity of the times has made to the claims of Papists. All these may be reckoned as mine enemies; although, peradventure, many of them may choose to regard me as so inconsiderable a person-

age as to be scarcely worth their enmity. I cannot be supposed, however, to enjoy their good will. They are, on principle, my opponents; they are naturally my enemies. But my friends know that I have worse foes than these; that there is a multitude of carping, snarling, back-biting, "brethren, falsely so called," who either do not, or will not, understand me; who suppose that I stand in the way of their aggrandizement or of their vain glory; and who either themselves wilfully invent calumnies against me, or else cordially let pass or circulate those which they find ready made to their hand. Now I must meet this pestilence that walketh in darkness; I must put into the hand of every man that stands by me an answer to the caviller, so that his mouth may be stopped, and that my claim to occupy the position which, however unworthily, I do, may be vindicated against the treachery of pretended friends. I feel myself, as an individual, so totally indifferent to the cavilling of those whom I have alluded to, that I should think it quite unnecessary, as far as I am personally concerned, to notice them. Indeed, I may say their malice has never come directly under my observation. The very nature of calumny implies as much; it is uttered in the absence of the individual assailed; it is cloaked by the appearance of friendship when he is present. Those who think it worth their while to take advantage of its existence, in order to injure or disparage the object of their jealousy, perhaps, or envy, are very careful to make him suppose some other ground for their injurious conduct. Indeed, they practise it, hoping rather that the existence of the calumny may be a cover for their injustice, a reason on account of which it may lie snug, may escape public observation, and therefore public rebuke, than as thinking that it could, with any prospect of success, be made use of by them as a defence.

I have heard it stated, then, that there are some who found an objection against me upon the position which I occupy in the church. They are anxious that I should be regarded as in some sort irregular. It is well known that I do not preach in the churches of the archdiocese of Dublin, and that I do not possess the license of the archbishop; and my "candid friends" either really believe, wish to believe, or pretend to believe, and thus lead others to believe, that I labour under some species of professional degradation, which should deprive me of influence, and alienate me from the friendship and support of those amongst whom I take a leading part. Now, I totally deny that I ever sustained any manner of ecclesiastical censure whatsoever. I trust I may flatter myself that I have deserved none. In order to make this plain, I shall give a brief sketch of my ecclesiastical career, and of my intercourse with the Archbishop of Dublin—Dr. Whately.

Having laboured for about nine years as a parochial minister in Yorkshire, (the first half of that period in the parish of Dewsbury, within a few miles of Leeds, and the other half in the town of Sheffield,) I felt extremely anxious to devote my labours to the service of Ireland. The exceedingly degraded condition which a vast number of the poor Irish who reside in England are reduced to, is very humbling and

painful to the mind of an Irish clergyman resident in that country ; at least, I felt it to be so. There is in every English town a complete realization of St. Giles', in London—a dark, filthy, disgusting locality, inhabited generally by Irish of the working classes, intermingled with a few English of low character, all of whom keep lodging-houses for “tramps,” that is, for wanderers of all sorts—beggars, hawkers, and labourers—looking for employment ; perhaps the majority of these migratory hordes are Irish. The neighbourhood where they resort is always opprobrious for riot, disorder, and crime ; and it is actually from these localities that the mass of the inhabitants, the unreflecting multitude, take up their idea of Ireland and the Irish. No doubt the better informed have more correct notions, but you distinctly see in the face of the great majority in England, the moment they find out that a man is an Irishman, evidences of a sort of apprehension—a kind of “Oh, indeed !—— !” expression. The Irish resident in England, until he has established himself amongst a circle of friends, feels himself suspected in all directions ; and let him be ever so well established as an individual, the misery which he endures in noticing all his countrymen thus coldly viewed, in perceiving that with respect to every one of them the feeling is, “Oh, he is only an Irishman,” and in the painful consciousness that he should himself, however excepted as an *individual*, belong to a *class* which is popularly regarded as inferior—all this renders a residence in England to any Irishman who has a heart to feel, most irksome. This subject is one that I should like to open up in all its length and breadth ; and perhaps I may find some opportunity for doing so. I felt that Ireland was degraded by Popery, and that if I were furnished with any powers to war against that huge moral evil, the proper field for their exercise was not England, but my native land. I was, accordingly, exceedingly anxious to obtain an eligible position in the Irish church. I do not mean eligible as to emolument, but one in which I might be able efficiently to bring my energies to bear against the degrading system which is the true cause of the miseries of this country. Upon a casual visit which I paid to Dublin, I found that the chaplaincy of the Free Church, Swift's-alley, was about to be vacant by the resignation of the then chaplain ; and upon application to the trustees I got the appointment. These trustees consist of some Dublin clergymen, and a few lay gentlemen. The building originally belonged to the Baptists. They offered it for sale ; it was purchased by a sum voluntarily subscribed by individuals, who thought that it might be important to increase church accommodation in that neglected part of the city ; and it became, by this purchase, a church of Ireland proprietary chapel. Divine service had been for some time performed in it by my predecessor ; and although the congregation had been small, there were two promising institutions connected with the church, namely, a Sunday school and a Fellowship society.

I gladly availed myself of the opening thus made ; and, in the first instance, waited on the Archbishop of Dublin, as a matter of course,

to tender my allegiance. His grace I did not see; I had, however, a long conversation with his chaplain, the late Dr. Dickinson, and learned from him that the place had never been licensed. I considered, however, that patronised as it was by a number of excellent clergymen, supplied as it had been by a clergyman of the very first character for piety, rank, and orthodoxy, and sanctioned as it thus was, I should not scruple to avail myself of the opportunity for carrying out those views and feelings which I have explained above. The reason of the case seems to me to be this:—if the bishop disapprove of the employment of a building as a place of worship, he should prohibit it; he should interdict its recognition by his clergy. Nothing of this sort, however, existed in the case of the Free Church, Swift's-alley; several of the parochial clergy frequently conducted its services, and some of them were amongst its trustees. Allowed, therefore, as this place of worship was, I thought myself warranted to accept the chaplaincy. I confidently expected that a short time and a little exertion would obviate the anomalies that seemed to be connected with it, the nature of which I considered to be simply formal. Shortly after my interview with Dr. Dickinson on the 12th of May, 1837, I addressed a letter to the archbishop, expressive of the anxiety I felt to be strictly conformed, in every respect, to church order.*

To this letter I never received any reply, but neither did I experience any inconvenience from the anomalous position of the church. I devoted myself entirely to the preaching of the Gospel, and to the promotion of the institutions connected with the church; and I was constantly assisted in the services by brother clergymen. In a short time the congregation became quite a crowded one, and the most gratifying results flowed from the labours which were carried on in the church and in connexion with it. Nevertheless, I was still anxious to have everything in the shape of informality done away; and to attain this object I had a few additional interviews with Dr. Dickinson, without, however, effecting the purpose contemplated. I learned, upon further inquiry, that a technicality of a legal sort was an obstacle to the attainment of my wish. The law required, as I was informed, that for such a church there should be a limited number of trustees; I was given to understand that the number in the case of this church exceeded that limitation, and that, therefore, things should remain in *statu quo*. As the anomaly produced no unpleasant consequences to myself, to the trustees, or the congregation, we all felt very easy on the subject; and as the ministrations carried on in the church were strictly regulated by the rubric, and were working the most beneficial results, we could not but suppose that, as they deserved, they very probably had the best wishes of the diocesan for their success.

Things went on in this fashion until the memorable discussion between Father Maguire and myself, which commenced on the 29th of May, and terminated on the 7th of June, 1838.

* See Appendix.

I do not labour under anything in the shape of mock modesty. I know when I am right, and I know when I am wrong. No one would more willingly make an humble confession in a case of the latter sort; and so little do I see impropriety in claiming the honour that is my due in one of the former, that I hold it to be my duty to claim it. "The foolish man roasteth not that which he taketh in hunting." (Prov. xii. 27.) There never was a more noble triumph gained for the church than I gained in the discussion with Maguire. Previously to that discussion the position of Popery was both morally and politically triumphant. Mr. Maguire marched through the length and breadth of the United Kingdom, pouring scorn on our principles; scarce a week passed in which he did not fulminate a denunciation against some eminent churchman. If a bishop in the House of Lords ventured to hint that Popery was false, forthwith appeared a letter from "Father Tom," peremptorily saying to the right reverend prelate, before the face of the world, "You are a liar." If any legislator of eminence, in either house, ventured to decry any institution of the Pope, out stood our Goliath, and challenged him to the proof; and well did the Roman Catholic leaders in high places know how to take advantage of the circumstance. The boldness of their champion appeared to warrant the insulence of their tone, and gave a colour of equity to their most extravagant demands.

But was it only in high places that the vauntings of the Popish champion told? Was it only against Protestant statesmen that they were made to operate? No. There was not a hovel in the land that they did not pervade. They gave virulence to the bigotry of the lowest Papist; they were the source of a pang in the breast of every humble Protestant. He saw the wagging of the head, and the shooting of the lip, and the pointing of the finger; and as the action of scorn was rounded off by the question, "Why do not your ministers meet Father Maguire?" he experienced a sense of pain which can easily be imagined, and was operated upon by an influence, on the detrimental character of which it is unnecessary to enlarge. He was not met. Why? Because not one individual in the three kingdoms knew how to meet him but myself. I fully admit the vast superiority over me in point of eloquence, learning, and talent which some of my brethren in the ministry possessed. In these respects, the able, and eloquent, and learned B. T. P. Pope never had superior. I had, however, after the most laborious study of the subject, been forced to the conclusion that it was something quite distinct from all these qualifications which was demanded in order that Popery should be effectually encountered. The strongest documentary evidence that ever was advanced is but as rotten stubble against the shield of Popery. Persecuting bulls, intolerant decretals, sanguinary canons, rebellious notes, fire and faggot class-books, and gunpowder councils, accumulated by learning the most superhuman and diligence the most unremitting, and brought forward with eloquence the most admirable, would constitute in their most effective employment a mere *brutum fulmen* against Popery. The

weapon of assault must be essentially and simply the Word of God ; not a part of the Word of God ; not an Epistle, nor a Gospel, nor a Prophecy. The word in its totality must be glorified ; the whole must be exalted ; but into the forefront of glory and prominency must be placed those Scriptures in which God himself has, as with a pencil of light, depicted the apostasy. I know—I have demonstrated it—that except the Pope be attacked as the great Roman Antichrist, as that Man of Sin, and Popery as the great foretold Apostasy, there can be no victory against the Papist, supposing him to be, that is, a man of first-rate talent, and supposing that there may be on the other side but a moderate amount of it.

For my part, I think there is something peculiarly gratifying to the Christian mind in this. There is no portion of the Word of God so much the subject of "philosophic" scorn as its anti-papal prophecies. When your philosophers, for instance, hear Popery attacked because the Pope is the "little horn," or the "lamb-like beast;" the Popish church the "scarlet whore," or the Popedom itself "the ten-horned beast," one can easily conceive the disdain with which they burn, the supercilious contempt with which they would award to the expositor the alternative of being half knave or half fool. How others may feel on the subject I will not undertake to say. I speak for myself, and I consider that it is delightful to reflect that it is just on these things—which are foolishness to the world, which are the jeer, the scoff, and the derision of the infidel—that British liberty is based, the British throne secured, and the various orders of the State held in their due place. But for these Scriptures, though Protestant truth might have convinced the spiritually-minded or gained over the more thinking minority, it is very unlikely that it would have ever been popular, imbued the general mind, and ultimately controlled the State itself. And where would our liberties be if Popery were not merely demonstrably false? capable of being proved so, not by fine-drawn lines of reasoning, but in a manner so plain, gross, and palpable as to meet the intelligence, and excite the loathing of the callous, the obdurate, and the unrefined? I am not aware that any individual but myself, previously to the discussion with Maguire, had developed this thought, and urged it upon the mind as a matter of primary practical import. This I certainly did in more publications than one, in numerous lectures, and in a great number of public letters, as also in numberless pulpit discourses. I contended, that we had all been wrong in our mode of assailing Popery; that the result was those calamities which had overtaken the Protestant constitution and the church; and that the evil never could be remedied until we set ourselves right on these first principles. In fact, I considered that to insist upon the point was my mission; and when Providence opened the way to crown it with triumphant success; when he placed the eloquent champion of Popery and myself face to face, before the eyes of the world—for in the present day the world does contemplate, through the telescopic influence of the press, every transaction which has the character of that to which

I allude—and when the result was in my person the triumph of Protestantism and the unquestionable annihilation of its distinguished opponent, I think that I am warranted to speak as an authority on the subject, and to claim for those views that were singularly successful singular correctness.

I repeat, then, I gained a great victory for the church. Where is Father Maguire now? Perhaps very busily engaged in what he thinks his parochial duties, but certainly never minding the church. What letters has he written since? Not one; and not one does he dare to write either. Why so? Just because he knows that I would answer it; that I would require the person whom he might address to hand him over to me, to tell him that he must answer me before he presumed to look for fresh antagonists. Where are now the boastings of the Popish priesthood? They reiterate, indeed, the cuckoo cry, "We are seven millions;" but they manifest on all occasions an evidence that they have lost their moral might. What is now the tone of the Roman Catholic masses as respects the question of religion? Drooping and despondent, full of shrinking and retreat. And how are the Protestants animated on the other side? They are full—filled with a consciousness of the immeasurable superiority of their principles, of their undeniable correctness; they look with triumph upon the silenced priesthood; they feel that the majesty of truth is on their side, and that circumstances alone are required to place them in the glorious position which they perceive themselves entitled to occupy, and which they know themselves able, by the divine assistance, to secure.

But it is not merely these results which have flowed from the discussion. I have completely revolutionised the mode of conducting the Roman Catholic controversy. I have convinced every churchman of the importance of church principles; and prepared in every locality of the land a champion ready to stand forth to meet the pretensions of the Popish priest who might be disposed to play the braggart. The sound of the cry of a Protestant populace kindled into an enthusiasm which raised them above the depressing circumstances of the times had not been heard in the streets of Dublin since 1829 till I raised it by the overthrow of my celebrated antagonist; that cry was re-echoed in the provinces; it crossed the channel; it re-kindled the fires of Protestant enthusiasm, and operated a powerful influence in the production of the new position of parties in the State.

The result of this discussion, as far as it respected my church, was, first, a still further increase of the congregation; the church became quite crammed, a number of country clergymen being generally present; and, secondly, numerous demands began to be made upon my services. I was solicited to preach in all parts of Ireland and England. This circumstance first caused me to feel the inconvenience of my position; I began to find it extremely hard to get my place supplied. If there were clergymen from the provinces, or from England, in town, when I found it necessary to be absent, it was easy enough to manage; but I soon learned that the clergy of the diocese were

indisposed to officiate in a church that was informally constituted. There were a few whose scruples did not reach so far, but they, when occasion required, were not always to be had. When instances of this sort occurred, the consequence was annoyance and embarrassment. In order to remedy the evil, I multiplied my solicitations at the Palace, but I still found the legal technicality to stand in the way.

I have made it a rule, ever since I entered the church, to be strictly regulated in all considerations respecting my position in it by the voice of Providence. I should have considered myself quite unwarranted to throw up an appointment to which I had been called by any considerations of inconvenience connected with it. It always seemed to me most improper that a clergyman should occupy himself in endeavours to get an easy place. In the present instance I looked upon the church at Swift's-alley as my post of duty, and I dared not throw it up. I again and again represented the grievance of my position to Dr. Dickinson; and when I found that it could not be remedied by the concession of a license to the building, I requested that it might be pronounced irregular by authority, and disqualified as such, on which I should at once resign; the doctor urged that, not being qualified by law, it might be considered as disqualified, and that, in fact, I was no other than a dissenter by being connected with it. I replied that I should consider it a very foolish act to give up a place as disqualified which was in no respect then more so than it was when I was appointed to it; that I had ministered in the place with much acceptance, and had there, under God, accomplished much good; and that if I relinquished such a position without a substantial justification, I never could excuse myself if ill consequences followed. I was perfectly aware of the questionable character of my position, and studiously avoided asking for permission to preach in the other churches of the diocese. That could only be granted me as a favour, which I had no inclination to solicit from his grace. What I wanted was, to have my position rectified by a proper arrangement, that I might thus, in consequence, minister where I chose as a matter of right.

Thus circumstanced, I was requested by the best clergyman that I am acquainted with—the most single-minded and excellent, the most fearless and uncompromising, my dear friend, Hugh Edward Prior, of Lucan—to preach a sermon in his church, on the Apostasy of the Church of Rome, on Sunday, the 12th of January, 1840. Father Maguire had preached a consecration sermon in a new Roman Catholic chapel, at Lucan, a week before; and my friend was anxious, under the circumstances, that I should reply to him, for this was the first occasion on which he ventured near the metropolis as a preacher since his defeat at the discussion. I told Mr. Prior that I should be most happy to comply with his wish, if he could get the special permission of Archbishop Whately; but that in consequence of the peculiar circumstances of my church, I was not licensed in the diocese, and would not choose to have myself announced on so special an occasion, nor to preach without the express sanction of the archbishop. My

friend, however, took upon himself the responsibility of publishing my name for the sermon; and the archbishop, thinking, I suppose, that his authority was disregarded, issued an inhibition to the churchwardens, desiring that no one should be permitted to preach on that Sunday without being licensed. I had certainly before preached in Lucan church; but, as it was comparatively in a private way, I did not think it needful to ask permission; nor did I consider my former act a warrant for the use of such a liberty on an occasion which was likely to obtain much notoriety. I cannot but say, that I consider the act of the archbishop to have been quite reasonable. It relieved my mind with respect to Swift's-alley. Here, by an overt act of his grace, the irregularity of that place of worship was pronounced a matter of importance, and I could not hesitate a moment. I was conscientiously devoted to the doctrines and discipline of the church. I never would have allowed myself for a moment to occupy a position that was irregular, if it was distinctly declared by the authorities so to be. Having been led, by the circumstances above detailed, to take the Free Church, Swift's-alley, (and I may explain, by the way, that it was called the Free Church merely because all the sittings were free of any manner of charge whatsoever, there being no such thing as pew rents,) and having found it a post of great usefulness, where I laboured for a length of time without any annoyance, and always without reproach, I should have considered it to be flying in the face of Providence, rashly to relinquish it. The case, however, had become quite altered. The Church was now publicly proclaimed by the authorities as irregular; and I felt myself constrained, as by the command of God himself, to resign. God speaks by providences as plainly as in the Scriptures.

I subsequently was elected to the benefice which I now hold, the chaplaincy of St. Nicholas Within. When elected by the patrons of the living, "the churchwardens and honest parishioners," I immediately applied to Archbishop Whately for a licence. Pending, however, the receipt of his grace's answer, I instituted an investigation as to the character of the incumbency, and I ascertained that it was a "donative, with 'exempt jurisdiction' and without cure of souls," the duties being simply the performance of divine service once a week. I ascertained that the incumbent was warranted by law, free from archiepiscopal control; and that very serious detriment to the living might be involved, if the chaplain accepted the license of his grace. Accordingly, when I had ascertained these facts, I begged leave respectfully to withdraw the application which I had in the first instance made. The chaplains of St. Nicholas Within are, through royal charter, by the very fact of their election, licensed to fulfil their duties without the intervention of any political sanction. The charter makes their ordinary to be, not the diocesan, but the churchwarden and parishioners.

Under existing circumstances, then, while altogether independent of the archbishop, I am a beneficed clergyman duly licensed to perform the functions of my office. My impression is, that every beneficed clergyman is entitled to preach in any pulpit into which he may be

invited. I believe that the archbishop thinks differently; that his grace supposes that though a clergyman be beneficed, still that his, the archbishop's, sanction is necessary to entitle him to preach as of right. I should have no objection to try this question in a court of law, were the occasion afforded me. An opportunity for doing this once occurred; but it was frustrated by a third party.

I was invited to preach a charity sermon in Stillorgan church shortly after my election; I replied that there was nothing to hinder it, and that I should comply. Archbishop Whately uttered a similar inhibition. I would, however, in this instance, have stood upon my right and preached, notwithstanding the inhibition, had the rector allowed. He, however, did not wish to litigate the point with his grace, and so the question has not been brought to an issue.

I never asked Archbishop Whately for the privilege of preaching in the pulpits of the diocese generally, because I consider that that concession could only be granted to me as a matter of favour. Now, as I am utterly opposed to his grace's views on matters both religious and political, and as I have always felt myself bound openly to denounce his sentiments, I did not think that it was proper that I should ask a favour at his hands. Whether, if I thought fit to ask, he would refuse me or not, is more than I can tell. My present impression is, however, that I should keep clear of him altogether. I consider that there is something providential in the position that I occupy. If I were placed under circumstances where I should claim his grace's license as a right, I should not hesitate to do so.

I could not, however, for one moment compromise the utter hostility which I entertain towards his views, by soliciting *favours* at his hands.

Sunday, the 12th of January, 1840, was the last occasion on which I appeared in Swift's Alley, when I delivered a suitable address, which appeared in the *Statesman* of Tuesday, the 14th of the same month.*

I have always been disposed to regard the whole current of events respecting my settlement in Dublin, and my present position, as providential; nay more, the experience which I obtained in England, the knowledge which my residence in that country gave me of the practical operation of Protestantism upon the condition of a community, the contrast that I was thus enabled to draw between the claims of the Reformed church and of the Church of Rome to the preference of mankind, have operated with such effect upon my mind, and so forcibly marked out and determined the course which I had to pursue, that I have constantly been disposed to recognise the finger of God in the whole process. Allow me, briefly, to make a few remarks growing out of the narrative:—First, had I been placed as a curate in one of the Dublin churches, or been brought by any arrangement under the influence of Archbishop Whately, it is highly probable that I would

* See Appendix.

have been altogether prevented from making any of those exertions which I cannot but consider as very important, and which at least have engaged a considerable share of public attention. Secondly, had I, however voluntarily, chosen a position of irregularity, or manifested any disposition for a schismatical independence, I should be scarcely entitled to claim the character of a good churchman; nor should I enjoy the happy consciousness, which I at present do, of having always endeavoured, in every movement of mine, to act in strict conformity with the laws of the church, and thus to walk in the footsteps of the flock. Thirdly, there can scarcely be a doubt but that Archbishop Whately would, had I been subject to his control, have prevented the discussion with Maguire, and thus the victory for church principles which that discussion involved; and, on the other hand there can be no doubt but that Mr. Maguire himself would have declined a meeting had I been open to any charge of irregularity. Fourthly, still, merely technical as the irregularity in the case of Swift's-alley was, after a while it began to be felt as irksome; and immediately after, what followed? I was providentially delivered from the embarrassment. I, for my part, always regarded the circumstance which compelled me to resign that place as the distinct voice of Providence; and when it issued, what then? A door was immediately opened; a strictly independent position, and yet regulated by law, was afforded to me. I was not aware of the exempt jurisdiction which the chaplaincy of St. Nicholas Within enjoyed, until some time after I was in possession of it. I had actually applied, as before stated, to Archbishop Whately for a license; but it was as if the Lord said, "You shall labour in this diocese, but you shall be independent in it; you shall be strictly and undeniably connected with the church, but I have placed you under circumstances in which you need not fear the face of man."

I certainly must say that I consider this whole train of circumstances very remarkable; and I conjecture that there are responsibilities connected with the peculiarities of my position which are of a very prominent character. I have been often solicited to seek from the archbishop the privilege of preaching in the diocese: I am advised that this belongs to me as a matter of right. If I am entitled to enjoy it as such, I can speak out with a good conscience if my right be conceded to me; this, however, cannot be expected until some one is found who may be willing to stand in the position of a litigant with Archbishop Whately, to have the matter decided by law. If, however, the privilege is not mine by *right*, I am strongly of opinion, that I should not compromise the peculiar liberty of my position by seeking it as a *favour*.

The law of the Church of England does not say that we are to exercise our ministry by the sanction of the bishop, but by the sanction of the ordinary. Generally speaking, the bishop is the ordinary; but there are a few cases in which the law exempts a clergyman from the rule of the bishop, and places him under a different authority: for example, the vicar of Newry is not under the jurisdiction of the Arch-

bishop of Armagh, but under that of Lord Kilmorey. That nobleman is, as I have been informed, the lord abbot of the district.

The warden of Galway affords another instance of an Irish clergyman who is exempted from episcopal jurisdiction. I believe there are no other cases in Ireland, save these three, of a like peculiarity. I am informed, however, that there are instances enough of the same sort in England. The ordinary, to whom alone I am subjected by law, is the churchwardens and parishioners of St. Nicholas Within in their corporate capacity; and since I am thus circumstanced by the laws of the church itself, I am entitled to be regarded as strictly and precisely a regular clergyman, as duly licensed as any other whatsoever. I am warranted to claim at the hand of every churchman, the praise of being orderly; and I will certainly claim the privilege of regarding that man as a very very bad churchman, who shall presume to cavil at my position, because the church, in its wisdom, has been pleased to make it a peculiar one. If a clergyman from the diocese of Down, or Ossory, or Cork, came to preach in the diocese of Dublin, he would claim permission to do so on the ground of being in due subordination to his lawful ordinary. It is precisely on the same ground that I would claim a like privilege. If the archbishop could exclude the former, then he could exclude me, but not otherwise.

On the occasion of the inhibition with respect to Lucan, Mr. Prior, notwithstanding that inhibition, offered me his pulpit, if I chose to preach; not out of disrespect to his diocesan, but because he was under the impression that letters of orders were alone necessary to entitle a clergyman to preach. I, however, declined the offer, being convinced in my own mind that a clergyman who was not duly licensed could not do so of right. My circumstances, however, are very different at present; I am now, in every sense of the word, a beneficed clergyman, strictly conformed to ecclesiastical rule; and therefore I warrant all my friends to treat with just indignation any calumnious slanderer who presumes to question the perfect, the essential, the peculiarly regular position which I occupy, and the severely orthodox character of my ecclesiastical *status*.

I trust it may be clearly understood, that, though I do not preach in the diocese, save within the limits of my own parish, in which I am unquestionably warranted by law to officiate, and in which I am subject to a peculiar "ordinary," I labour under no sort of ecclesiastical censure, ban, or exclusion. I have not been "silenced," nor "stripped of my gown," a phrase which I believe Papists have occasionally made use of to my disparagement. I am as perfectly licensed as the archbishop himself, wear my gown as proudly as he does, and carry a surplice as unsullied as his grace's lawn—in one word, I am as independent of his grace as he is of me. I trust I may always continue to oppose him so long as he opposes himself, the Bible, and the church—all which, I am convinced, he does at present. I have often been exhorted to have recourse to irregular practices, in effect to join the dissenters. Pious men have quoted to me the language of St. Paul—

"Woe is me, if I preach not the Gospel." And they have added, what good would John Wesley have done had he submitted to the tyranny of the bishops? Of what avail would have been the piety of Watts or Robert Hall, had they waited for episcopal sanction? I have met the objection by stating that I was no judge of another man's servant; that if the Spirit of God sanctioned the irregularity of those distinguished persons, which as a sovereign he might do, the same Spirit might forbid mine, might render it impossible that I should have an easy conscience where they had consciences void of offence. The Spirit of God, which caused Paul to say, "Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel!" may make another to cry, "Woe is me if I run without being sent!" How do we know what might have resulted from the labours of Wesley and others, had they been exerted within the church for its reform? Perhaps they might have originated by far a greater amount of good than resulted from the secession of the men, supposing that the consequences of that secession be good at all. Had I originally declined the chaplaincy of Swift's-alley Free Church because of its informality, some other person would have accepted it, and, in all probability that informality would have existed to the present day. Had I thrown it up prematurely, there can scarcely be a doubt but that I would have been placed in a locality distant from Dublin, perhaps from Ireland. Those labours which I have originated here would never have taken place. Acting as I did, the result has been, the total removal of the irregularity and the promotion of a more strict feeling of churchmanship generally, without detriment to my general usefulness. I shall be disappointed if it do not prove hereafter that the anomaly of my present position has been a matter of importance to the church.

I do not think that I shall offend any one by the apparent boldness of the assertion when I say, that the mode in which I managed the discussion with Mr. Maguire entitled me to some share of respect, consideration, and attention on the part of the Archbishop of Dublin. Perhaps this assertion will be thought warranted when I remind the reader that my conduct upon that occasion drew upon me the enthusiastic encomiums of both clergy and laity in all parts of England and Ireland. Testimonials of favour, boundless in number, were conferred upon me both publicly and privately. A sum of above a thousand pounds was presented to me; and, without one single exception, the whole Protestant press was lavish of the eulogies which it expended upon the victory that I had obtained. I say, then, that I think it will be allowed that I am warranted in concluding that I might have expected from the Archbishop of Dublin something in the shape of notice, at least, and consideration. If I were right, I was entitled to expect encouragement; if I were wrong, correction. My reward was, however, heartless indifference, contemptuous disregard.

Another man in the position of the archbishop might have made such use of my victory as that Popery in these countries never could

have recovered from it; he would have used the influence which gave him the ear of statesmen to point out to them the importance of meeting the demands of the Papists for political power by enlarging on the moral disqualifications of their system—disqualifications which had been demonstrated before the face of the public; he would have brought them to realize the important verity that, in a question of abstract truth and falsehood, it never could be an answer to say that five millions of ignorant people were attached to the latter. In effect he would have regarded the victory as a position gained, and he would have been careful to prevent the forfeiture of it by any mismanagement, and to act in such a way as to afford no opportunity to the Papists for an escape from the consequences—no occasion to them of turning the defeat which they suffered to their own account. I can conscientiously say, that there was not one single circumstance in my character or conduct that should not have entitled me to the favour which I assert my claim to. I had lived studiously, laboriously, prayerfully. The innermost thoughts of my heart for years before are not mere matter of speculation with me. I need not depend on the treacheries of memory in order to form an estimate of them; they are on record with ink and pen, and they demonstrate the thoughtfulness of my mind, the singleness of my view, and the laboriousness of my habits. Of the discourses which I was in the habit of preaching, the public will soon be furnished with a power of forming a judgment;* and yet, with all this, after the soundness of my views had become the theme of universal praise, the importance of my victory for the church the subject of general gratitude, and my whole conduct the occasion for the outpourings of public generosity—without a blemish, a flaw, or a stain on my reputation—what did I receive from his grace? what ought I to have received? Countenance, encouragement, and approbation. Not merely should the embarrassments that I laboured under in my chaplaincy at Swift's-alley have been removed, but a more extensive field of usefulness procured for me. My energies should have been enlisted in the service of the church in such a manner as would have confounded its adversaries. I should have been recognised as no ordinary man. I should have received the honour that was my due; but I did receive—what? An inhibition, save the mark! I admit that there was an occasion for it in the irregularity of my position; but why had not that been removed? Had I been an aristocrat it would have been removed. I was, however, but the son of a Dublin tradesman. I was not a Ponsonby, nor a Pakenham, nor a Trench, nor a Beresford—I had no hereditary fortune or eminence of rank, in the church or out of it, and therefore it was supposed that I was *facilis injuriæ*—a creature that might be trampled on. I do not

* I alluded here, in the first edition, to the publication of a volume of sermons then in progress. This volume has since appeared, under the title of "Sermons on the Evangelical Doctrines of the Apostolic Church, by the Rev. T. D. Gregg."

despise aristocracy of birth; the man that would do so is a fool: but he who imagines that aristocracy of soul can be treated with indignity, shows that he is himself ignoble, and he will go down to posterity with the brand of ignobleness on his character. If elevated to rank by adventitious circumstances, posterity will pronounce its true verdict upon him. It will say, "Here was a man that was distinguished for a diligence that was worthless, became famous for an ingenuity that was perverted, and was rewarded with a success which was undeserved; he used his eminence in the church to promote the parasite and to crush the worthy; he used his eminence in the State to promote the principles which he had sworn to be 'superstitious and idolatrous'—a worship which he declared by oath to consist in a 'blasphemous fable and a dangerous deceit.'" The reward, then, which I received from his grace was, every possible exertion to shut me out from the church. The official act to which I have alluded on his part, so far from injuring, served me; but it was open to misinterpretation, and misinterpreted it was. Papists gloried in it as a proof that Maguire had been victorious over the church in his contest with me. They actually in their ballads chanted pæans of triumph, as though the archbishop had thus given his decision in favour of the champion of Popery. In fact, nothing saved the church from detriment in this matter but the notorious pro-Popery character of his grace. Protestants stopped the triumph of the Papists by the pithy declaration that the archbishop was the partisan of Dr. Murray, and naturally led in his conduct by pro-Popery tendencies. So much was this felt to be the case, that Popery derived but small benefit from the blow aimed at me.

Mark, however, my conduct on the occasion. I bore the insult without a murmur; not a syllable of complaint escaped my lips. After I had resigned the church in Swift's-alley, and previously to my election to St. Nicholas Within, there was an interval of a few months, in which I was unemployed. During that interval I was frequently solicited to come forward, in order, either by published letters or public speeches, to keep up the feelings which I had originated. I, however, uniformly refused compliance, stating that so long as I was left without a position in the church, I should not think myself warranted to mix myself up with questions which concerned her interests, and with which I, from circumstances, had nothing whatsoever to do. If conduct the most conciliatory and unobjectionable can be supposed capable of softening down causeless enmity—supposing it to have been enmity—surely I might now have expected something resembling favour at the archbishop's hands; or, taking the lesser case of indifference, might I not fairly have expected that now it would have been laid aside, and that the evidence which I had afforded of uncomplaining submissiveness to authority, because it was authority, should have met its due reward? Nothing, however, of this sort took place.

In due season I was elected to the chaplaincy of St. Nicholas Within. An opposing candidate stood for the office; he was supported by the

votes of the Roman Catholic parishioners; although he put himself forward on the castle interest, it being distinctly understood that the then Whig government would bring the claims of the Roman Catholics to elect into the court of Queen's Bench, he could find among the Protestant parishioners only a proposer and a seconder. The two fearless Protestant churchwardens, however, being the returning officers, on legal advice returned me, supported as I was by all the Protestant parishioners, (save the two before mentioned,) and enabled me through them to fight the battle for the church. Here also I was triumphant. By the unanimous decision of the court, the claim of Roman Catholics to interfere with the patronage of the church was distinctly negatived. The lawsuit cost me in one way or another, about £200. Might I not have expected that the archbishop would then have come forward and said, "Well, Mr. Gregg, the principle which you have established is a great one for the church. The benefice that you have got is, however, a poor one. Without relinquishing it until your church is rebuilt at least, you may hold this small office, which I consider it my duty to present you with, and which will not interfere with the duties prescribed by the rules of your chaplaincy. We must not allow you to expend your small means in fighting a battle of principle, which concerns the church even more than it does you as an individual." Or suppose he had not gone so far—suppose, without conferring on me any position in the diocese, he had said, "I see that your jurisdiction is exempt; I approve of the decision which you have come to, not to ask a licence from me. Now, however, that you have proved yourself so valuable an auxiliary, and made it clear that no consideration can lead you to the adoption of any course prejudicial to the church, I beg that you may understand that you have my full sanction to preach in the diocese. Though our opinions on speculative points differ exceedingly, I am sure you will prove a generous adversary; and if you think it necessary at any time to exercise those rights of citizenship which the laws unquestionably give to every citizen of this free country, I trust that you will exert your influence at every public meeting which you attend, to prevent any course of conduct which might be prejudicial to the church." I ask, would it have been extraordinary that such conduct as I had exhibited should have met such treatment as I have described? I am sure, reader, you will say—not. I have stated the way in which the archbishop should have acted. But how *did* he act? Why, leaving me to bear the expenses of the lawsuit, he immediately conferred on my opponent a living of £600 a year; though this opponent was a bachelor, and had resided in Scotland since the rebellion of 1798. I have let drop, during this commentary, the fact that the church of St. Nicholas Within is in a state of ruin. I perform divine service once a week, but in the parish school-room; I have also a weekly meeting in the parish, in the Tailors' Hall. Neither of these, however, is the pulpit. The pulpit is the proper arena of the minister; though not confined to that platform, that is peculiarly his own. The archbishop knew that I had no pulpit;

he must have been aware, else is he most unfit for his position, that a clergyman who does not preach is placed under circumstances calculated to be detrimental to his own spiritual welfare. Countless valuable moral influences which would flow from habitual pulpit labours, are wanting. He becomes liable to be secularised in his character, to lose that high tone of spirituality that should distinguish a man of God—that I may say nothing about suffering those exertions to be in some measure lost to the church which might have been secured for it; about the benefit to the souls of others that was thus sacrificed—I ask, under these circumstances, and in the view of such principles, where were the “bowels of compassion?” Where were the tender mercies of a true shepherd in him who could have endangered my immortal soul by a system of heartless, Christianless, unmerited neglect? and what consequence could have flowed to any one whom Providence had furnished with less power of resistance than myself, other than a broken heart and hopeless despondency? The conduct pursued by the archbishop was calculated to overwhelm me with hopeless poverty, to reduce me to a condition of friendless indigence, to drive me from the church, or to make me contemptible in it; and this when I deserved its rich rewards, its ample gratitude, its warmest recognition. Thank God, however, the power that enabled me to fight the church's battles, has enabled me to fight my own; and the spirit that animated me is not so limited in its influence, but that it has raised up hosts of valued friends to rally round me, and forbid the consequences that would naturally flow from the total absence of the paternal character in the Archbishop of Dublin.

The poet sings—

“An honest man's the noblest work of God.”

I agree with our distinguished countryman, Oliver Goldsmith, in denying the truth of the sentiment. The negative quality of not being knavish is far from being descriptive of God's prime handiwork. No! it is the true Christian—the man whose heart overflows with the milk of human kindness, whose breast beats with every sentiment that is truly liberal and truly noble—who can bid away his own selfish prejudices when they would militate against the interests of a man of worth—such a man is, under the sun, the “noblest work of God;” and such a man, or anything like it, the archbishop bears not the slightest possible resemblance to. He may be “honest,” he may have been an able pedagogue at Oxford, but he is utterly unqualified to fill the see of Dublin; he may have written college treatises on all sorts of subjects; to me he has proved no better than a learned curmudgeon. He might have had me for his friend, for I am on friendly terms with many an opponent in speculative opinion; he has, however, chosen me for his enemy. I regret it, but I cannot help it, and so I drop the subject.

I have likewise heard that I have been subject to slander because of the nature of my services in the church at present. I have been

informed that persons have been heard stating, that I receive my ecclesiastical income in payment for praying souls out of purgatory! Ay, actually, this has been cast in the teeth of some of my attached friends. That this should be done by Papists were little to be wondered at. I have myself heard Roman Catholics say as much. That any one calling himself a Protestant should take up the reproach, seems to me most astonishing. I cannot doubt, however, that it has been done. I am sure I need scarcely take the trouble of giving a distinct and most unequivocal denial to the imputation. I perform divine service in my parish once a week, and in a manner strictly conformable to the rules of the church. The charter which established the chaplaincy prescribes the duty of the incumbent; and that is simply, the weekly performance of divine service. That those who endowed the living were themselves the victims of Popish superstition, which had at that time entirely corrupted our church, there can be very little doubt; but this was the case with a vast number of the benefactors of the church in the middle ages. Much of the land which the Archbishop of Dublin enjoys was left for superstitious uses; he, however, very properly interprets the wills of the donors in an evangelical sense, and employs their benefactions for the perpetuation of services cleansed from the defilement of Popish superstition. The objection, then, which I have alluded to as made against me, applies to almost all the ministers of the church. I recollect that a Roman Catholic gentleman once attacked me on this ground; he charged me with taking money to say mass, and instead of this, performing for it services which the donors would have thought heretical. I met his objection thus: "Sir," said I, "you charge me wrongfully; and if you knew my history, you would see that yourself. I am a remarkable character, sir. Though not very elderly in appearance, I am now in reality about fourteen hundred years of age." My friend started at the information. "Be not surprised, sir," said I, "you shall hear my story. I was ordained by Saint Patrick, shortly after his arrival in this country, and preached the very same doctrines that I do at present. Things went on very pleasantly with me for above seven hundred years, at which time the English, at the instigation of the Pope, invaded this our native land; they did all they could to seduce me from that simple faith which I had learned from the great apostle of Ireland, and, alas! with too much success. My mind became corrupted by the superstitions of Popery, and at last I became quite a bigot in that line; and in those days of my darkness, I not only myself had a zeal which was not according to knowledge, but I thought I was doing God service when I succeeded in persuading the people to devote almost all their substance to the maintenance of those idolatries through which I was bewitched. In the reign of Richard II., I was appointed Chaplain of St. Nicholas Within; and I took great pains to induce the parishioners to make a handsome provision for my old age, which, persuaded as they were of the importance of my Popish principles, they readily did. I enjoyed the provision which they made for me, blindly practising the errors which I was

imbued with for above a hundred years, until the period of the Reformation. Then, for the first time, I began to perceive the delusions of which I had been the victim: that I had altogether departed from the faith of Saint Patrick, and had not only gone wrong myself, but had been a blind leader of the blind. However, my eyes were now opened; and when they were, I did not resign my chaplaincy, neither did I give up the provision which I raised for it in the days of my darkness. I applied it to the use for which I had persuaded the donors to grant it—although unfortunately at that time neither I nor they knew how to accomplish what we aimed at—the glory of God. And I have ever since happily continued to practise and to preach, through the support which it has rendered to me, the precepts and the principles of the Primitive Christian Church. I do not think you can say,” said I to my friend, “after this full, true, and particular account, that I have perverted the purpose of my endowment, or applied it to a purpose different from that which it was originally intended to accomplish.”

I regret that there should be any Protestant so thick-skulled, so doltish, or so traitorous, as to need an explanation of this matter; but since it appears there is, I put on record my parable to the Roman Catholic, as calculated to show to any one of intelligence the equity of the claim which the minister of the church of Ireland can put forward to the possession of whatever church property he may be the lawful ecclesiastical inheritor of.

Having done with this subject,* there is another which I must touch upon. After I had resigned Swift's-alley Free Church, a number of my kind friends called a meeting in order to raise funds to build me a church. Upon my election to St. Nicholas this dropped. The question has often been put, as I am informed, what has become of the moneys then collected? Have they gone into Mr. Gregg's pocket? I reply—No, not one single farthing of them. I never as much as handled one single penny thereof. Trustees were nominated to that fund; a secretary was appointed to it. I am sure that these trustees and that secretary can accurately account about the whole matter. I am, however, a mere circumstance in the case, and have nothing whatsoever to say to it. I trust I have said sufficient on this preliminary subject; and, that it may be understood that, through God's blessing, I do, as a clergyman, stand perfectly free from anything in the shape of censure or reproach. I will not say that I do not deserve both. God forbid! I acknowledge my short comings and my misdoings. I know if God would enter into judgment with me, I could not answer him one in a thousand. I am convinced that I might much more profitably for myself, for society, and for the church, have occupied my talents. I am a sinner before God in thought, word, and deed. I make no pretension to any other character; but I can say, with a clear conscience, “Against Thee, Thee only have I sinned.” As it respects my fellow-men, whether as individuals, as bodies, or as a church, I can

* See Appendix.

truly say that I have, to the measure of my ability, endeavoured to keep a conscience void of offence towards them all. This only I would ask as a favour, that if any man have anything to say against me, he may say it to my face; and that no one may believe a calumny uttered behind my back, until he have first given me an opportunity of hearing what it is, and of standing up in my own defence.

CHAPTER III.

IS POPERY ENSLAVING AND DEGRADING? HAS THE TIME COME FOR ITS
OVERTHROW IN IRELAND? A BEAM OF HOPE.

I am afraid that Dr. Whately regards me with all the enmity that he feels towards the line of policy which I advocate. He is a Whig; I am a Tory. He believes that Roman Catholics may enjoy an equality, as to constitutional privileges, with Protestants; I am sincerely convinced that liberty cannot be firmly secured without the maintenance of Protestant ascendancy. He thinks that Roman Catholics can be drawn from their errors by the spread of secular education; I am convinced that unless counteracted by scriptural education, Popery will thrive, flourish, and luxuriate; that improvement in the mathematics, in the arts and sciences, is no more antagonistic to Popery, than improvement in music, dancing, drawing, shoemaking, weaving, swimming, leaping, sailing, or riding is; nay, I conscientiously believe, that if the light of Scripture were withdrawn, and that the two systems, Protestantism and Popery, were submitted to the "philosophers," as contending for the government of the human family, the preference would undoubtedly be given to the latter. I admit that there is something like a solecism in this thought; for inasmuch as Protestantism makes its boast of taking the Bible for the standard of its principles—so that it is a kind of proverb, (and one that is not very far removed from truth, although it does not exactly hit it,) that the Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants—it is apparent that a comparison between the two systems could not, irrespectively of the Scriptures, be instituted at all; still there is importance in the idea. The "philosophers" might have the Bible in their hands; they might be privileged to open its pages and scan its doctrines; they might cursorily do so; Voltaire did this, Thomas Paine did this, almost all the "philosophers" of our own times do this; but if they only do this, if they do not drink into its spirit; if they be not divinely illuminated as to its contents; if, in fact, they know no more of it than the merely natural man in his ordinary indifference to spiritual subjects does; I believe that thus informed, animated, and disposed, they would upon serious consideration be inclined to award the preference to Popery, as a system for swaying mankind and governing society.

Conceive, for example, the case of one of these philosophers placed in a position where he could take a bird's-eye view of the state of things in England and in Austria. In both he would see the populace professing belief in the same general creed, and in the Bible as the revealed Word of God. In Austria, however, he would see the populace bowed down to the earth before their priests, imagining that they were to derive every spiritual blessing through them, and in consequence wielded by them at their pleasure. He would perceive that the rulers governed the priests as effectually as the priests did the people. He would observe as the result of this system, the people quiet, submissive, and obedient; giving everything to their rulers, and receiving back from them in return, with profound gratitude in a great many cases, the necessaries of life. He would perceive those who got nothing turning up their languid eyes in submission to what they thought the will of Providence, and dying without a murmur, provided only they were oiled by the priest. He would perceive at the same time, dancers, and fiddlers, and pipers, provided in great abundance, to entertain the whole community. He would pass over, as mere accidents of the prospect, a number of dark dens and gloomy gaols, holding fast bound in misery and iron some bold spirits who presumed to execrate the whole system, as one of lies, knavery, and humbug, and who would not be easy when they were bid; and he would class under the same category, as a mere accident, the fact that the whole nation offered up the greatest part of their veneration to the Virgin Mary and the saints, to stocks, stones, and relics. There would be profound quietude, however, in the general, throughout the realm. The grandees would have a jovial life of it, without anything to check their pride; the emperor, an immense army with huge mustachios and well-sharpened swords, to restrain the refractory at home and win respect from allies abroad; while the people would all the while be as free and merry as birds in a cage.

Our philosopher would then turn his eyes to England, and there he would see a populace all glorying in liberty, while vast multitudes of them, however, were sunk in licentiousness. Drunkenness, revellings, and starvation, as the consequence, he would behold in abundance, with a vast amount of insubordination. He would see the people in general setting very light by their priests. He would see those priests, upon the whole, very different from the sanctimonious fraternity, with haggard countenances and canonical liveries, who ruled the destinies of Austria (for he had made it his business to overlook the Friar Tucks who appeared among their number). The English priests he would perceive undistinguished from the people generally by any very remarkable garb, and almost all men with families. He would see the majority of the people working for themselves in a manner quite independent of their rulers; giving to the latter but a small portion of their earnings, and this with no inconsiderable share of grumbling; while they canvassed the conduct of these rulers with a laborious inquisitiveness which was very distasteful to the latter, and with a

freedom of language that our philosopher would regard as impertinence. In fact, he would see the rulers much more afraid of the people than the people of them; while there would be seen amid the masses monster gatherings, and be heard from them such loud hurrahs, "immense cheers," "tremendous cheers and Kentish fire," "great groans," "renewed groans," &c., &c., mingled with a buzz and a din from the incessant movements of what he could scarcely distinguish from a disorderly rabble, as would be calculated completely to disgust our wise man. It would appear quite an accident of the survey, that in every nook of the land there were seen individuals in retirement studying the sacred page, testing all the dogmas of their clergy by that unerring standard, and worshipping God in spirit and in truth; that it was from amongst these that thinking and religious men, taught by their priests, came forth every now and then to constitute the leaders of the rest; and that, notwithstanding the folly and the sin that were too prevalent, the influence which these exerted, not merely gave its tone to society in general, but exerted a converting influence upon no inconsiderable portion of it.

I think it can scarcely be doubted, but that the contemptible race of infidel philosophers who exert so fearful an influence upon the present times,—the scoffing, sneering, jeering wiseacres, who compose, for example, the majority of the existing parliament, would, in the contemplation of the two scenes which I have drawn, be very much disposed to yield the palm for superior social influence rather to Popery than to Protestantism. This would be likely to be the case, supposing that they had taken even the complete survey which I have supposed; but when the purblind creatures do nothing of the sort; when they studiously fix their attention upon what seems the unfavourable portions of the Protestant picture, and upon what seems of a contrary character in the Popish one; when they consider, for example, English drunkenness as contrasted with Father Mathew's witchcraft, and its "delightful" results; when they compare a "pampered parson of the 'Law Church,'"—to wit, a curate on £75 a-year, with twelve children and a wife—a vampire, a blood-sucker, a tithe-gorger—with "the apostle of temperance"—that "great and good man," who is the "saviour of his country," and who is so famous for writing sugar-candy letters to every "Very Dear Sir" that has the philanthropy to enclose him from £1 to £50; when they contrast the stern Bible-reading curate, who, that he may show an example to his flock, and bring up his children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord—instead of marching at the head of troops of "teetotallers," with "very magnificent banners," and a most harmonious band which plays every sort of foreign fandango in a bunch of keys—is obliged to teach a small school for his own support—the humble fulfilment of his duty to his family, remember! and his best endeavours for his flock, doing more for the benefit of society than could be effected by all the bachelor-priests who ever propagated amid their blind dupes the lies and superstitions of Rome;—when they contrast, I say, the lean

Protestant curate with the sleek, well-booted, and popular Jesuit, who has been so amazingly successful in his various spiritual speculations, I should be quite surprised if the balance of admiration and approval were not entirely on the side of the latter.

No, irrespectively of the Scriptures, understood in their severe spiritual sense, their pages diligently scanned and their sanctions profoundly revered, there is nothing in education hostile to the haughtiest pretensions of the Roman Antichrist. Is not O'Connell educated? Are not Sheil, and Wise, and Wiseman, and all the wise men of the Popish colleges, educated? Are not the Cardinals and the Pope educated? And has all the learning of Oxford, when separated from a profound primary paramount veneration for the Word of God, saved the Puseys, the Newmans, the Wards, and the Oakleys, from being carried away by boundless admiration for Popery, accompanied with an utter abhorrence and contempt for Protestantism. Away then with the heresy of Archbishop Whately, that the prevalence of secular learning is likely to militate against the interests of Popery!

Dark as the times are, my opinion is, that they promise more for Protestantism than it ever yet possessed in Ireland. Amid various disheartening occurrences, there is one pleasing feature of the times, it is this—the Protestants of Ireland have begun to manage their own affairs, or, at least, to look after their management. This is, in my mind, a most important fact. It is to be recollected, that Protestantism in Ireland did not go through the regular growing process; it did not originate from the gradual ingress of truth, on account of its own merits, into the mind of a large number of the inhabitants. It was the consequence, rather, of a great political movement, than of the convictions of the heart and understanding of any considerable section of the people.

Very different was the case in England. The bright rising of the morning star of the Reformation, the Rev. John Wickliffe, Vicar of Lutterworth, attracted the attention of almost the whole English people. The doctrines of that great man made considerable progress during his lifetime, and gathered to him a large body of followers. When he himself was withdrawn from the scene, these, in augmented numbers, remained behind. They drank in wisdom at the fountain head; and like all who derive their religion from the serious perusal of the Holy Scriptures, they were enthusiasts in the best sense of the term. The nickname of the Lollards was soon fastened on them; but the truths which they experienced the power of in their hearts and promulgated by their testimony, were more powerful than either ridicule or persecution, and could neither be laughed down nor hunted down. They gradually progressed among the people; they crossed the German Ocean, and broke out in Bohemia. The followers of Huss were equally denominated Wickliffists and Hussites. Vain was every attempt to impede the march of enlightenment. It prepared numbers for the bright day which was approaching. Martin Luther, a Divine

creation, was called forth by Providence to meet the occasion. He was indeed a burning and a shining light, which not merely gleamed effulgently over all the Continent of Europe, but whose beams shone brightly in England, and promoted the spread of the principles of Wickliffe to an unexampled extent. They had gone on increasing, but slowly, from the time that they were planted by the first of the reformers; but through the influence of Luther, they so mightily prevailed, that, while Popery was the established religion of England, the mind of that country may be said to have been subsoiled by Protestantism. Hence, when circumstances caused Henry the Eighth to fling off the yoke of Antichrist, he found that the majority of his people were more than prepared for the change; they were disposed to rejoice in it. Had a similar attempt been made at an earlier moment, it might have cost the monarch his crown: for instance, the religious reformation in England would have been an impossible problem in King John's time. Unquestionably great as was the influence exerted by Henry the Eighth, he was after all but a circumstance in the case. The work of reformation had been essentially accomplished by the Lollards; Henry did no more than confer upon it national recognition and influence.

No doubt he may have thought very differently himself. He may have supposed that he was the beginning, the middle, and the end of the great national movement; although it may have been a scarcely recognised consciousness of its feasibility that disposed him to break with the Pope, and shaped his course towards that breach, which, in due time, actually took place.

"Men are the slaves of circumstances, when
The circumstances seem the slaves of men."

Henry the Eighth may have easily supposed that the change which he so readily effected in England, could with as much ease be accomplished in Ireland; and, indeed, the result may have operated, so as to confirm the delusion. Conviction had wrought the change in the English mind; it was real and solid, it was the work of the king only in appearance. Tyranny wrought in Ireland, in one respect, similar to conviction in the sister country. When the command issued from court, the Pope was renounced, at least from the teeth out, and the old principles, revived as they were by State authority, at once professed—professed, but not embraced; assented to, but not believed. The heart of the people was Popish; their lips only yielded the acquiescence which the king demanded.

The views which I have here set down, apply equally well to the state of things under Edward and Elizabeth. In the latter reign the whole nation complied with the commands of the sovereign. The churches of the Protestant establishment were universally frequented; there were comparatively, whether among the clergy or the laity, but few recusants. The result proved that the change was superficial. There is, however, no knowing but that it might have gradually increased in depth and in solidity, had the willingness of the people to

embrace the prescribed principles been taken proper advantage of, and prudently fostered by pious and learned pastors. Such, however, was far from having been the case. The best posts in the church were made subservient to State corruption, and the people were handed over wholesale to ministers who neither understood their language, made consideration for their prejudices, nor laboured for their improvement. Under such circumstances, it is little wonder that the early promise should have ended in disappointment, and that it proved ultimately to be the case, that few embraced the principles of England who were not themselves of English blood; that at length Protestant and *Sas-senach* became interchangeable terms.

In consequence, the emissaries of the Pope took advantage of the state of the public mind; they saw that with little effort Ireland might be secured to Rome, and the progress of the Reformation to a great extent stayed. This proved to be, unhappily, but too much the case.

From what has been stated it will be tolerably obvious, that the Protestants of the Reformation in this country were almost all English. They habitually looked to the sister country for strength and for support. While they occupied a position of ascendancy, as respected their Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, they were habituated themselves implicitly to bow to the orders which came from the other side of the channel. Thence their nobility and gentry derived their titles to their estates. These nobles and gentlemen were their landlords, their masters, their employers, their leaders. Through their influence they had ready access to all the subordinate places under the government, and thus they would naturally grow into a feeling of complete dependence upon them.

In one word, Protestantism in Ireland was established and grew rather by court policy, than by the power, and working, and native vigour of the truth that was inherent in it.

The nobles habitually swayed the masses, and the masses habitually yielded to them.

Bear it in mind, however, that Protestantism was true—this was its essential characteristic, this its solid ground for preference—that, moreover, Popery was false, unscriptural, and unreasonable, and that this was the proper ground for its rejection. This *small* difference between the systems, however, was the subject of the slightest consideration. That which should have been primarily regarded, was considered a matter of indifference; namely, the truth or falsehood of the systems. The question was not, "Which is the religion of Christ, and which that of Antichrist?" but "Which is the religion of the master, and which of the slave?" Could a Divine blessing be expected by those who thus trifled with sacred things?

Nevertheless, God left not himself without witnesses. Through every period of the Irish church there were raised up men who valued the truth for its own sake, and on that account laboured for its extension amongst the people, and with no inconsiderable success too. Judgments, however, impended over a race who had been too generally

unfaithful. The Protestants had enjoyed their ascendancy with comparatively but slight murmurs on the part of those Roman Catholics who were subject to them; they were mingled among them and learned their ways; and a too prevalent indifference to religious matters on both sides, caused the adverse parties very nearly to coalesce. The Protestants began to think that the restrictions which had been originally placed on the growth of Popery might safely be done away. "What have we to fear in the shape of religious intolerance from men who have just as little religion as ourselves? and why should we claim ascendancy over them when they have just as much? The difference between our principles is parallel to that between tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee. Give them what they want, and let us have no more bother about it."

It was this prevalent spirit of faithlessness which originated the "Roman Catholic question," and at last rendered it triumphant. Concession created demand; surrender encouraged assault; and we now see everything giving way around us. The habit of yielding in all points to the will of the English cabinet, seems still to influence the higher orders; the people, however, have flung off their subservience. Alarmed for their church, their liberties, and their existence, they have looked more deeply than the history of their country for the origin of their faith. They have discovered that it has come down from heaven; that it is entitled to rest upon a basis more solid than the will of the English minister may concede to it; and they are standing out in the might of their numbers and in the power of the Lord to declare, that though England first established their church, God originally consecrated it; that though England gave them their religion by law, it was bequeathed to them by testament in the everlasting Gospel; and that, if their leaders will not take their post at their head in the onset that threatens, they will marshal their ranks without them, and trust to God and their right for prevalence and victory.

Yes, it is a most encouraging sign of the times, that the Protestants of Ireland seem disposed to take their affairs into their own hands; that they seem inclined to learn the important lesson, that, quite irrespectively of the mind of cabinets, the decision of ministers, and the inclinations of lords and gentlemen, they have rights growing out of the Bible, which they are bound and which they are able to maintain. Whether I may claim the privilege of having been instrumental, or partially instrumental, in bringing about this state of mind, it is not mine to say; this, however, I will say, that I have earnestly, anxiously, and incessantly laboured to be so.

Why is England a prosperous country? Because the general will is made known.

The will of a people which is governed by Protestant principles must be almost infallibly right. It has the Word of God for its guide, and it has the privilege of freely discussing its sense.

Though an individual or a party may mistake the meaning of

Scripture or pervert it, it is very unlikely that a whole people should. The general will can scarcely have a sinister object to effect; and the mistakes of an individual or a party are likely to be set right by the general voice.

If I were to give advice to the Protestants of Ireland, it should be this: "Guard against being made the tools of leaders; maintain the right of saying 'yea' or 'nay' to everything in which your interest is concerned. The people of God should be something like God himself; they are renewed in his image, they are made after his likeness, and they should not allow their name to be taken in vain. Protestants are God's people; they are so by profession, they should be so in reality, and they should allow no man to say, 'Thus saith the Protestant people of Ireland,' when that people have neither spoken nor been allowed an opportunity to speak. They should not allow one single association to be formed bearing upon their interests, their position, or their prospects, without a full, open, and fair public meeting, in which they should hear its nature, character, and objects fully detailed; in which they should have ample power to declare who shall be its leaders, managers, and officers. In other words, every thing should be brought under the influence of public opinion; and the power of managers and cliques who set at nought that opinion, should be utterly, and independent of all immediate considerations, broken to pieces. If the people want to be triumphant, they must put an end to humbug; they must learn the interest that each of them has in every public movement; and they should take especial care that their voice, consent, and approbation should not go for nought."

The state of society, then, heretofore has been such, that ministers calculated on the people, because they supposed that they could secure the leaders or silence them. With these leaders the people had ever gone; without them they had constantly been quiescent. Though this position of dependence, and this movement in the footsteps of others, would not seem to be quite so creditable to the spirit of the people, nor honourable to their characters, as self-originated action—springing from the suggestions of principle would have been; still there was nothing at variance with principle in it. Whatever might have been the real motive, "Protestant Ascendancy" and "No Popery"—that is to say, no idolatry, no Antichrist, no religious humbug—were put into the foreground. Whatever string moved the puppets in the front, the power which they employed to move their followers was truth, reformed Christianity, the Bible—Protestantism.

All worked well so long as truth was ascendant and the march of the leaders in its wake: when, however, the traitorism of '29—the responsibility of which, unfortunately, rests upon a pair of Irish shoulders—working its natural results, changed, through the Reform Bill, the whole posture of affairs; when Popery became a preponderating power in the State; and then when, after huge exertions of the Protestant strength of the nation, a Conservative ministry was forced

into power; and when the head of that ministry proved false, or rather, indeed, gave confirmation to the character of treachery with which he had been before stamped, indignation wrung the soul of Protestants. They found that Peel, instead of being penitent, was but the more hardened in his iniquity; that instead of having learned wisdom and honesty from the past, he was determined to persist in what was false, and to carry out what had proved foolish and insane. But that which grieved them most of all was this, that the indignation of their trusted leaders who had, through their instrumentality, hurled the Whigs from power, and demonstrated beyond a doubt, that when Protestants stood forth in their might, they were as morally invincible as they had ever been victorious in the battle field; that the indignation employed against the Whigs was changed into bland remonstrance or absolute approval, when nominal Tories propounded even worse degrees of evil. When they saw the sons of their chiefs clinging to the skirts of the traitor, and their own presence at their head supplied by letters of apology, or even by those of sharp rebuke—when they beheld all this, they turned out in their own might, and it was instantly perceived that truth gave a majesty to their movement that made it grand and glorious, though those who stood at their head had not coronets upon their brows, and but few of them could boast a higher rank than that which was denoted by “Reverend” prefixed to their humble names. I glory in the recollection of the last twelfth of July. I exult in the contemplation of the march on that day at Lisburn. I venerate the firmness of the honourable though dishonoured Watson—his honour is his own; the dishonour intended for him has been branded indelibly upon the tyrants who perpetrated the atrocity. I triumph in the prospect of the demonstration at Enniskillen on the 12th instant, the thunders of which are still reverberating through the realm. I rejoice when I remember, that foremost in the file of faithful Christian patriots, marched the stalworth Operatives of the Irish metropolis, and not undignified was that display. Rank, character, and ability, were also mingled with them. The name of Ferrand, M. P., will be written in the page of Irish history. Henry Smith, D. L., J. P., may claim the honour of a supersedeas. Maunsell Eyre and Alexander Johnstone Montgomery, through the veins of both of whom flows noble blood, and Hugh Edward Prior,

“Amongst the faithless ever faithful found,—”

all these stood, on the anniversary of the Boyne, under the wide canopy of heaven, at the head of four thousand unconquerable Protestants of Dublin. Yes, three glorious days were these. The men of Dublin, Lisburn, and Enniskillen, were forbidden, discouraged, and left to a great extent uncoun tenanced; but they have awakened a spirit in the Protestant breast, which, I trust, never will be lulled again. They have demonstrated to both high and low, that Protestantism in Ireland can stand upon its own legs, can advance by its natural force, and be impeded neither by the treachery of open foes, nor by the backward-

ness of noble friends. I believe that a lesson has been taught which will not soon be unlearned.

And here I feel myself called upon, in a manner much more distinct and explicit than I have yet done, to render honour where honour is due. It was the Protestant Operatives of Ireland who first, by themselves, took their stand for Protestant ascendancy upon the ground of Protestant truth. The Protestant Operative Association of Dublin was formed in the year 1841. The men of Cork soon followed their example. All honour to the men of Cork! For public spirit, distinguished talent, devoted piety, and noble patriotism, Cork will be renowned! The Protestant movement there was very nearly simultaneous with that in Dublin. Belfast with its tens of thousands, the stern and hardy sons of the north, calm to judge but firm to resolve and bold to dare, soon marshalled their moral battalions. Glory to the memory of old John Knox! The face of man ne'er fear did he; and the race that follows in his footsteps are like-minded. Yes, Presbyterianism and Episcopalianism are one in fact: their surname is Protestant; the designations that distinguish them mark a distinction indeed, but scarce a difference. They were both banded and blended in the operative body of the northern capital. Soon did all Ireland arouse at the moral battle-cry. Bandon, Youghal, and Dunmanway, Castletwellan, Lisburn, Ballinderry, and numerous other localities, whose names I regret that I cannot put on record—for the movement of all, though one in object, was distinct, unsuggested, voluntary, and perfectly independent, and often not known beyond the locality where it originated—soon showed how dauntless and determined was the Protestant heart. Unquestionably the operative movement was a great and decisive one. The reports of the public proceedings of the associations, though excluded from the press of the Protestant aristocracy, made their way throughout the country through the instrumentality of the organs of the people and of the clergy—the *Warder* and the *Statesman* journals, which are distinguished equally for ability and for principle. They were read in the homesteads of the Orangemen; they produced conviction by the power of truth, and soon did conviction produce the determination to act. I cannot doubt but that there was a close connexion between the previous movement of the Protestant operatives and the subsequent demonstrations in the north. In fact, previously to the latter, the operatives had originated many "monster meetings." Their Boyne anniversary soirées were magnificent and imposing. They led the way in the anti-Maynooth gatherings. Indeed, to a very great extent, those demonstrations were of the operative character; and on several special occasions the associations in question had taken a conspicuous and a powerful stand, although not always crowned with the successful issue that was sought for. The result was, that the Protestant community grew into an acquaintance with its own power; began to learn that the materials which could compose an army that might be triumphant against the world, consisting of intelligent, Bible-reading, God-fearing men, who spurned the trammels of

priestcraft; whose language was taken up, not parrot-like, from the dictation of the masters who engaged them, but derived from the lively oracles of God, were entitled to an amount of respect of a different character from that which might be vouchsafed to the serfs of noble landlords, and were possessed of a power which could enforce it.

I am greatly in the hope, that what I have here said may tend to confirm upon the mind of my readers a principle which I consider most important, and which, I am sure, has its foundation in truth. I admit, however, that I did not derive it from *a priori* considerations. I learned it in England. It was forced upon my mind in that land of glorious liberty. We all lament the present condition of the English mind; its apathy with respect to Popery in Ireland is lamentable, but it will rectify itself. The freedom of discussion which happily prevails there, the diligence of inquiry, and the deep-seated veneration for the Word of God, are certain, by their conjoint operation, soon to set John Bull to rights. I freely avow that it is the inspiration which I drank in of British liberty which animates me as an individual. The operation of the spirit of British liberty upon the mind of foreigners who may inhale it, derived, as it is, from Protestant truth, will grind to powder all the despotism of the world. Well may the Pope desire to subdue England to his yoke; well may he set every line, and bait every hook, to catch British fish. May he succeed, however, no better in the future than in the past time; and his spoil be no richer than those gudgeons—Pusey, Newman, Spencer, and Co. In this department of his piscatory labours his success has certainly been small. Old John *Times* shows with how much vehemence Bull can rage, when it is attempted to palm off Popish nonsense upon him as though it were Christian religion. Certainly, the efforts of the Pope at bringing over the English people, by the seductions of his creed, have been a failure. His political speculations have proved much more successful. However, as aforesaid, the operation of British liberty and so forth, will, in due time, set all to rights. But to resume—the principle which I have alluded to is this, that in a Protestant community, *the determination to move is the prerogative of the people; the privilege to preside, that of the nobles*. I observed that this was always the rule in the sister country. The public mind became instructed, public opinion became formed; this led to a determination on the part of the people to act, and then they would call on the aristocracy to take their place. If they consented, all was right; if not, onward moved the mass independently; *and, if they were right*, they soon brought the others along with them, or else, if the movement were stayed for a while, the people took their stand for their opinions, and made every plan impracticable till they were first satisfied themselves.

I do not think that mere mass movements in a wrong cause, such as Chartism or Repeal, can be successful. These derive their vitality, not from principle, but from circumstances. A popular demagogue may constitute their essence; his removal will involve the dispersion of his followers and the explosion of the hopes which he created. The

bubble has burst! Far different, however, is the case when the object contemplated has its origin in the reason of things, and may expect a blessing from on High. In this case, perpetuity of exertion may be expected, and ultimate success be regarded as certain.

However, I repeat, it is in public opinion in a Protestant community to carry the leaders; and not in the leaders to govern public opinion. When the masses feel that they are right,—when they have learned from their Bibles and their reason that they are so, it is their duty to move, and to let the responsibility of being inactive rest upon those who may be liable to it. In fact, Protestants should manage their own affairs. But I must not encumber you, friendly reader, with so much that is didactic, logical, and ratiocinative.

Learning, a short time since, that Mr. Newman was about to become an avowed follower of Antichrist, I took the liberty, hoping that the man was still reclaimable, of transmitting to him my edition of *Mede's Apostasy of the Latter Times*, prefixed as it was with my unanswerable essay on the Popish controversy. That essay conveyed my ideas as to the erroneous manner in which Popery had been previously assailed. It showed that the ordinary process could issue in nothing but disappointment to the Protestant advocate, and detriment to the Protestant cause; and it prescribed a mode of conducting the controversy, which in almost the weakest hands must confound the ablest adversary.

The following letter accompanied the book:—

St. Nicholas Within, Dublin, July 16, 1845.

REVEREND SIR,—I beg to apologise for obtruding upon your attention. The great public interest connected with your views—an interest which has become enhanced by an event supposed to be forthcoming—has induced me to address you.

I take the liberty of enclosing a volume, which I published some time ago, to the introduction to which I request your attention.

That introduction is, in fact, an essay on the Roman Catholic controversy. It undertakes to prove that that controversy cannot be successfully maintained against Roman Catholics in this country, save in the assertion of Anglo-Catholic principles. Perhaps you may not have read the essay or considered the principles which it involves. It is because I consider them of paramount importance, that I venture to bring them before you.

Subsequently to the publication of these views, a public discussion with the most celebrated of our Irish priests afforded me the best possible opportunity of testing their correctness. It was universally confessed that that priest, the Reverend Thomas Maguire, was in that discussion utterly confounded; and it is my firm belief, that no priest whatsoever can successfully maintain the cause of the church of Rome, if he be encountered on the principles which I have advanced in my essay, and which I acted on in the discussion alluded to.

I am convinced that if you were as well acquainted with the results of Popery as a residence in Ireland would make you, you would feel with me, that that system is one which is essentially degrading in its character. With all its evils, the moral condition of England is as much superior to that of Ireland as light is to darkness. A mistake on this point is likely to be productive of the worst results.

I can scarcely presume to suppose that you are not fully acquainted with the views of the great and good Joseph Mede. I am far from assenting to all the details of

his interpretations; but how it is possible to avoid assenting to his general outline, I cannot conceive.

Pardon me for saying, that if you become a Papist, as reported, you will be, in the worst sense of the word, an apostate; an apostate from a true church to an apostate church, from Christ to Antichrist.

I am sure you will not suppose that I speak thus out of any indifference to your feelings. I should, however, be exceedingly anxious to be instrumental in giving your thoughts a direction which they may not have previously taken, and which might tend to prevent a result that would be painful to your brethren and pernicious to yourself.

I should say that the volume which I enclose is not my own. I have not a copy of the work in my possession. It is borrowed. The marks in the margin are those of the owner, merely designed for his own satisfaction. Under these circumstances I am constrained to beg, that, at your convenience, you may return the book.

Rev. sir, yours very faithfully,

Rev. J. H. Newman.

TRESHAM D. GREGG.

Of course I post-paid the parcel. I received it back by return of post, with a charge of 3s. 4d. postage, and the following note:—

Littlemore, July 21, 1845.

REVEREND SIR,—As you say in your letter, which I have just received, that you have borrowed for me the work you send, (though I did not ask you for it, and have books enough to read without it,) and say also that you wish it back, I lose no time, with thanks for your kind intention, in returning it to you.

I am, Rev. sir, your obedient servant,

The Rev. T. D. Gregg.

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

I immediately thus replied to my churlish correspondent:

St. Nicholas Within, Dublin, July 24, 1845.

REVEREND SIR,—I beg to acknowledge your short note returning the volume which I took the liberty of transmitting to you. They have this moment come to hand. I feel benefitted by the insult with which you have been so good as to visit my uncalled-for obtrusion upon so celebrated a character as you are, and by the momentary sense of pain which that insult produced.

I acted as a busybody, and have been treated as such. If I do not “thank” you for this, I hope I may profit by it as to the future; while your mode of treating my letter, so exactly conforming to the tact of the Jesuits, both in Ireland and everywhere else, affords an illustration of the incomparable wisdom of the Blessed Saviour as exhibited in the precepts contained in Matthew vii. 6, and xv. 14. Your communication also, though brief, will be worth preserving: it is full of character; and as you are likely to be famous, it will, in that point of view, be a curiosity. The haughtiness with which you look down upon my humble pretensions, and the well “acted” humility (since I am unwilling to offend, I shrink from the employment of the Greek derivative*) with which you talk of “thanking” me for my “kind intention,” at the very time that you treat my intentions, my letter, and myself, with the utmost contempt, are all, I assure you, most edifying to me, and fill me with gratitude to God for having kept me clear of the detestable Pharisaism of the most detestable of all systems—“the masterpiece of Satan,” Popery.

I have nothing more to add, than that I apologise for having troubled you with my book; that in my present letter I design no offence, intending simply to speak what I believe to be true; and that in thus terminating the correspondence which my ignorance originated, I confess myself to have mistaken your character in some respects.

I remain, Reverend sir, yours very faithfully,

Rev. John H. Newman.

TRESHAM D. GREGG.

* Hypocritical.

From the correspondence, gentle reader, learn this truth, that if you be in the right, however ingeniously malignity may contrive to do you an injustice or offer you an insult, straightforward candour and simple truth will be quite sufficient to furnish you with weapons of defence, and enable you to cast back the injury upon the aggressor.

CHAPTER IV.

INTERFERENCE IN POLITICS A PRIME CHRISTIAN DUTY.

The most remarkable peculiarities of English society grow out of an attribute of the English people, which I lament to say has not, as much as it ought to have done, belonged to us in Ireland; I mean, PUBLIC SPIRIT. The most ordinary Englishman feels that he is entitled to exert an influence upon the State; that, to a certain extent, he is responsible for everything that may be done by the government. No matter how humble his occupation may be, he feels that he has public duties as well as private ones; that he has not merely to labour for his daily bread, to get a living for himself and for his family, but that, as a citizen of the State, it is his duty to see that all is right, and consequently that it is his business to make all those inquiries, and obtain all the information, that may enable him effectually to perform his part.

The existence of this state of mind produces the most wholesome effect on the condition of society. Should anything in the shape of oppression be perpetrated on an individual, attention is called to the matter through the journals, and presently there is a ferment and outcry. Each person seems to feel that he is himself concerned; indignation gathers and finds expression in multiplied remonstrances, until at length, if the law be available for the obtainment of redress, its engines are set to work amid the applause of the people to obtain it; although the great probability is, that public opinion, connected as it is with the known determination of the people, will, without the necessity of an appeal to law, produce a rectification of what is wrong. There is no disposition on the part of society to silence the clamour of individuals by saying, "What business is it of yours?" On the contrary, the more active one may show himself to interfere against a case of wrong, the more certain he is to receive general approbation, and to be looked upon as in some sort a general benefactor. When resident in England, I found in every district some individual whose "organ of combativeness" seemed finely developed, who was ready to fly into a passion at a grievance and who was furnished with his measure of constitutional information to enable him to carry on the war.

When the state of mind that I have here described is regulated by wisdom and moderation, it constitutes, in the best sense of the term, the public-spirited citizen ; and prevailing through the community to the extent it does in the sister country, it is astonishing how beneficially it works.

In fact, every one in England lives under the impression that it is a part of his duty to attend to the public weal as well as to his own, and the existence of this state of mind displays itself in all directions ; it operates in the villages, in the streets and lanes of towns, upon the communities themselves which inhabit these towns. Civilisation has supplied it with instruments of all sorts, reasoners, declaimers, and enthusiasts ; writers on every sort of page, the street ballad, the broad sheet of the *Times*, the quarto of *Punch*, the octavo of the *Reviewer*, and the parchment of the remonstrating petitioner. There is not merely an active public opinion, but that public opinion is sound ; it can bear the test of reason, argument, and Scripture. It is not a public opinion originated for the occasion by a popular demagogue, and which must be taken without examination or it will be found to be utterly baseless ; but it is one which, if not created in the closet meditations of the cottier, as he seriously peruses the sacred page of inspiration, finds in these strength and conviction ; and it is, therefore, uniform, inflexible, and mighty.

Now, I must freely say that I think there is a vast absence of this public spirit amongst the Protestants of Ireland. Of course, when I speak of the Protestants of Ireland it must be with a proviso. I am, however, rather under the impression that the characteristic is but too general. Still, I can only with certainty speak of the metropolis ; and speaking of it, I must say that public spirit is sadly deficient amongst our population.

So far from there being a prevalent disposition on the part of each to regard himself as charged with his due share of the public welfare, there is rather a reversal of the apostle's maxim, as though he had said, " Consider every man his own, and not another's wealth." (See 1 Cor. x. 24.) A worthy man may be struck down in our midst ; he may be wrongfully, unjustly, tyrannically treated ; he may be robbed of the fruits of a whole life's labour and conduct ; he may be reduced from prospects of advancement, and a competence for his old age, to contempt and absolute indigence ; and yet, the want of public spirit on the part of his Protestant brethren will cause him to be left to a state of helpless and hopeless despair.

I have at this moment in my mind the case of John Flint, late acting inspector of the metropolitan police. Never was there a more flagrant case of wrong than that man endured. He was victimised by remorseless official tyranny. After seeking for redress through the ordinary channels without being able to obtain it, he made known his case to me. The *Warder* newspaper, at my instance, took it up with spirit ; it laid the case in the complainant's own language before the public mind. I brought the matter before the Protestant Operative

Association. We addressed the authorities on the subject. Every effort that could be made was made, notwithstanding much discouragement, to arouse public sympathy. But it was without effect; the lord lieutenant actually refused to admit into his presence a deputation of gentlemen of the first respectability, who were anxious to present an address advocating the cause of their oppressed brother; yet, I am ashamed to say it, the refusal to concede this simple courtesy, which unquestionably had the character of an act of justice, excited no more attention, not to say indignation, than if the victim had been an outcast criminal, and the suppliants on his part but brethren in crime.

If this were an individual case it would be perhaps unworthy of observation; but I must confess, to the discredit of the Protestant citizens of Dublin, that it is but an illustration of the general rule. I appeal to the candour of the metropolitan reader to say whether I do not state the fact. It is with great happiness I testify that the indisposition to stand forward in such a case does not rest with the operative class. I can bear undeniable testimony to their public spirit; exceedingly warm was the interest that they exhibited in the above instance, and in several others similar. The apathy rests with the merchants, traders, and gentry, for I can scarcely say that we have a nobility in Dublin. If the term gentry do not include the clergy, I deeply regret to say that I cannot leave them out; they participate in the disgraceful want of public spirit that is the reproach of the metropolis, and the source of wretchedness and ruin to thousands of our brethren.

I amply admit that, in a pecuniary point of view, there is a munificent charity in Dublin. I do not hesitate to say that it exceeds what is commonly witnessed in the English towns. The collections at our churches for schools and so forth are large; indeed, I believe Dublin is celebrated in this particular; but I think it will be found that the language applies, "This ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone." The benevolence that leads a man to put his hand into his pocket, that he may place funds in the possession of the managers of a well-conducted public institution to carry on their operations, is praiseworthy, but it is not unaccompanied with a certain amount of public eclat, and it never brings down any share of public odium; if, however, to relieve the distressed or to instruct the ignorant be right, it is no less so to undo the heavy burdens and "let the oppressed go free, and to break every yoke." (Isaiah lviii.) Surely prevention is better than cure, and it must be more pleasing to an object to be protected in the enjoyment of his rights, than to be relieved in those distresses which their invasion brings on him. The church of God is said, in Scripture, to be "terrible as an army with banners;" and I have no doubt that a whole community, standing forth with manly indignation to denounce tyrannical conduct, or to demand redress for unquestionable wrong, though it neither implies nor threatens violence, has terrors for the evil-doer quite as great as would

be thought to exist in the force which armed men would employ. It must be remembered, also, that the performance of this Christian duty involves the exercise of a moral courage, which may be for a while connected with odium, and produce inconveniences to those who employ it, and which implies a greater power of faith than it does to part with a certain portion of superfluous wealth, or relinquish some of the elegances which that wealth might procure. It is really melancholy to see our bankers, and merchants, and traders, stand listlessly by, while positive injustice and tyranny are perpetrated with impunity and even reduced to a system.

The last statement leads me to dwell upon a plan of injury that I have known in several instances to have been employed in this city. I have known cases—I may say several—in which I believe that there was a distinct intention to injure an individual by bringing a charge against him. I have known that individual to have been accompanied with witnesses whose testimony would have led to his immediate discharge. Instead, however, of the individual alone being charged, and allowed the opportunity of calling on the witnesses to give their testimony on his behalf; these individuals have been included in the charge, and thus deprived of the opportunity of giving their evidence; and in this way the whole party has been brought in guilty; whereas, had justice been done, had those who were made defendants been allowed—as they ought to have been—to have been witnesses, the innocence of all would have been transparent. For a partial example: the other day three youths were embraced under a charge connected with a stabbing transaction—for such the allegation was. The case is so notorious and so recent that I need only refer to it in order to take along with me the intelligence of most of my readers. Against two of the traversers there was not the shadow of a shade of evidence; and had these been allowed, as they ought to have been, to give their testimony, it would have been seen that the charge against the third was frivolous. All, however, were made defendants; the case thus was rendered altogether complicated and one-sided; and were it not that providentially additional testimony was forthcoming, there cannot be a doubt but that the third innocent party would have been convicted; and thus, in all probability, the whole three, bound together as they were by the system that I have alluded to, condemned. I repeat, that I have known numerous instances of this sort of management—a management which would not for a single moment be tolerated in a community distinguished for the prevalence of public spirit.

I must say that I am convinced that much of the evil which I have alluded to, grows out of the miserable, wretched, imbecile cant—for I will designate it by no more dignified denomination—which leads the clergy, not merely to shrink themselves from what they are pleased to term political matters, but also to denounce all interference with such matters as in some sort of way unchristian. The result is, that when you appeal to individuals to stand forward and perform the duty of citizens the common reply is, "We never interfere in

politics;"—"If it were a religious subject I should have no objection to engage in it; but I abominate everything in the shape of politics."

I pronounce this to be no better than cant. By "cant," I think we may understand the adoption of religious language, when, in reality, there is no religion at all in the case.

"Religion has nothing to do with politics!" "The clergy have nothing to say to politics!" "True Christians should not interfere with politics!" Cant, cant, cant! Try the principle laid down in these popular proverbs by the standard of the sanctuary, and mark how far they fall short of everything resembling truth.

Does not the Lord Jesus Christ describe his people under the parable of servants, who had each different talents committed to his charge—to one was given five; to another, three; and to another, one. Now, what are these talents? I answer, powers of usefulness, opportunities for exertion; for every single power of usefulness we are responsible; for the employment of every opportunity for exertion we must give an account. Now does not the constitution under which we live concede to every subject of the realm the right of petition and remonstrance? and is not the concession of that right equivalent to the conferring of a most important power on every British subject? Be it understood that this is no small matter. It was no haphazard that caused the prerogative of the people to be thus extended. There was no such right of remonstrance in existence in Popish times; there is no such popular right admitted at the present day in any Popish country in the world; it sprung plainly from Protestant principles; indeed this is demonstrable by historical evidence. Nay, it was no milk-and-water Protestantism that gained the point; it was wrung from the rulers of the land by that which the Tractarians are pleased to call "Ultra-Protestantism." The man must be utterly dull who is incapable of appreciating the vast, the paramount importance of this most precious right; it places within the reach of the Christian community the power of effectually pouring scriptural truths into the ears of their queens, their kings, their princes, rulers, and governors; and since there is not one man who can sign his name to such declarations of truth who may not add a certain amount of force to their argumentative power—since every man is thus furnished with an open door whereby to join himself to the company of God's witnesses, he will be held responsible for the exercise of his prerogative, his right, his privilege, his "talent;" and if it be found "wrapped up in a napkin" because it is but small, he may receive the doom of the unprofitable servant, who was cast into outer darkness.

It is painful to see clergymen, in other respects faithful, at fault in this great matter. "Clergymen have nothing to do with politics!" Why not? Does the law negative the exercise of the right of remonstrance on their part? Are those who vindicated for the whole community the rights of Protestant citizenship, by any constitution of the realm deprived of that citizenship themselves? Have they been deprived of it by others? Have they voluntarily relinquished it?

Assuredly nothing of the sort has occurred. If, then, their Master who is in heaven have committed to them this talent, let them beware of being found negligent in the occupation of it.

I am under the impression that it is an attentive consideration of this view which will afford the most irrefragable justification for Church establishments, and for their effectual employment by the State. The subject has one talent; the monarch—the government, in its corporate capacity, has five. If they are placed as a city on a hill, if they are furnished with a power of making the light to shine in every direction, if the employment of these talents would, more effectually than any other course which they could adopt, promote the objects that they are appointed to accomplish—the effectuation of the happiness of the people, the overthrow of vice, and the advancement of virtue, the indefinite augmentation of the temporal welfare of the community, by the promotion, in the first instance, of its eternal interests—who is he that will come forward and say that they shall not thus improve their talents; that he will willingly pay taxes to enable them to purchase bayonets and gunpowder, fetters, and bolts, and halters, for the punishment of transgressors, but that he is exonerated from a right to contribute for the obtainment of means that would enable them to enlighten the darkened understanding, regenerate the corrupt affections, and thus prevent those crimes which overwhelm society with disorder?

The man who says that religion has nothing to do with politics, aims a mortal blow at all establishments for religion.

Why, what are politics? Politics are whatever bears upon the interests of a community. And has religion no such bearing? Has Christianity no bearing on the temporal interests of mankind? And if it have, who is there that has more to do with politics than the Christian patriot? The assertion that religion has nothing to do with politics, is a point blank heresy and no better; a lazy, cowardly, slug-a-bed heresy.

I conjecture that this putrid maxim has been foisted upon this country by ungodly statesmen, who were anxious to prevent the embarrassment that they would experience from the spirited interference of Christian men. They wished to exclude all such from taking any part in public matters, in order that they might more effectually work out their own selfish and unchristian ends.

At the same time, I admit that the ordinary politics of mankind are too often exclusively worldly in their character. The disposition of governors has ever been to regulate themselves rather by expediency and convenience, than by principle. The question with them is not "What is right?" but, "What is likely to advance our ends? be it bribery, be it corruption, be it wrong—no matter for that—will it secure to us the possession of place, privilege, and power?" And the arguments by which they are controlled, are too generally not derived from the standard of rectitude, nor grounded upon the revealed will of the supreme Governor, but upon the understood depravity and perverse

inclinations of the world in general. Hence it is, alas ! too much the case, that those who are mixed up with political subjects become quite secularised in their feelings, and hardened against those more pure and holy influences which it is the business of religion to cherish and promote. If this were the essential character of political matters, it would be quite legitimate to denounce every sort of connexion with them ; but it is far from being so. The business of the Christian is to counteract the depravity that mixes itself up with the government of God's heritage ; and I think it will scarcely be questioned, that it is to the secession of Christian men from these things that the vast prevalence of this depravity is to be almost entirely attributed. When the leaven that should leaven the whole is withdrawn, is it any wonder that the mass should display the worst results of its absence ? The mission of the Christian is "to overcome the world," to pervade it with the healthful influences of Gospel purity and Gospel truth, and not to surrender it as a spoil to the devil. It is, unquestionably, evangelical principle which has vindicated Protestant society into a glorious liberty which has broken the oppressor's arm, which has thrown the shield of a sound public opinion over the weakest lamb of the Christian fold ; and every such benefit will become forfeited, tyranny will wax strong, and darkness prevail, if the cant maxims which I have denounced be not rejected with the scorn that they deserve, and Christian duty fulfilled, if need be, with the spirit of martyrs.

I have likewise heard it urged, that by intermeddling with political matters, the Christian clergyman becomes so far assimilated to the Popish priest. I answer, so much the better. The Popish priest is perfectly consistent with his own principle. His activity, his diligence, and his zeal to promote the delusions of his system through a government influence, are worthy of imitation in every respect, save the end which they contemplate. Let us be equally diligent, active, and industrious—for Christ, however, and not for Antichrist ; for truth, and not for falsehood ; for God, and not for Belial.

What a noble lesson on this subject does our holy church teach us ! She warrants the rejection of no truth because it may be held by the church of Rome ; she rejects no wholesome form, practice, or ceremony because the same may be corruptly employed by Popery. Does not our Master, Christ, teach us the same lesson ? He fixes our attention upon the history of an unjust steward ; he dwells upon the anxiety with which he sought to obtain "his good things ;" he shows how he left no plan untried in order to effect his ungodly ends ; and when he "commends" the man's diligence, carefulness, and pains, his skill and ingenuity, he by no means warrants us to suppose that he regarded with other than the most utter abhorrence the principles which animated, and the rules which guided him. The truth is, we have gone wrong, not in imitating the political interference of Roman Catholic priests, but in allowing ourselves, because they improperly employed it, to be deterred from its proper use.

I am very much disposed to imagine that we might learn a great

deal more than we seem inclined to do from the consideration of the Romish system.

Be it remembered, that the world has never yet seen the system of the Church of England worked out.

I can scarcely conceive a more effectual mode of turning public attention to the immensely important results that would flow from the full and proper working of the English system, than by directing it to the contemplation of the most Popish country in the world. Look at Italy, and what will you see there? An incessant endeavour to fix the public mind upon that religion which is professed by all in common. At every turn of every road there is erected some popular idol; the traveller can scarcely proceed onward without being in all directions struck with the worship of prostrate devotees. As the labourer proceeds to his work, the matin bell reminds him of what he professes to owe to his God; and within the temple he bends before the idol, be it the image of Joseph, Mary, or of Christ. He perceives the veneration which he manifests himself participated in by all above him. On great occasions the whole community turns out to worship the golden idol, which Nebuchadnezzar the king—that is to say, the anti-type of that monarch, the Pope—has set up. Kings, princes, dukes, marquises, and barons, judges, sheriffs, and counsellors, the learned professions, the traders, and the artizans, united with the crowding peasantry—all led on by their clergy of every degree, join in the sacrifice of blasphemy, and drink in, from a common fountain, those strong delusions with which the general heart is drugged. What is the result of all this? Darkness and death, the infatuation of the people, and their tame submission to the most ruthless tyranny that ever broke the spirit of human beings. The wrath of God abides upon the land, and he sells as serfs into the hands of their oppressors the people who, in opposition to his express commandment, put their trust in man and make flesh their arm, and whose hearts depart from God. Unquestionably results apparently moral are amongst the deplorable consequences which I have enumerated. Just as children—whom their nurse would terrify from the repository that contains sugar plums, by the story that “the black man” would seize hold on them if they entered—refrain from the desired indulgence, so do the slaves of superstition in general abstain from those crimes that would inconvenience their lords, while the gloomy den and the sudden execution cut off the refractory exceptions without any of the tedious delays that would be connected with a constitutional system of government. All is dark as death, lifeless as the sepulchre; cold, chill, and cheerless as the regions of eternal frost. However, the religious system of the country is worked out to the fullest degree, and produces as its consequence a cup brimful of horrors.

The newspapers, a few months back, under the heading, “Horrible Occurrence,” gave the following facts:—A family had gone out to spend the evening, leaving the youngest child, of about three years of

age, in the care of the children's maid. The latter, in connexion with the other servants, took advantage of the opportunity for a jollification. This was disturbed for some time by the waywardness of the little fellow, whom its maid had put to bed. Informing her companions that she would go to quiet the child, she speedily returned, and they spent the rest of the evening quite free from any annoyance. Mamma was assured, on her coming home, that her little darling was as well as possible, and had been the best behaved child in the world. She went up stairs to feast a parent's eyes, and, upon drawing the curtains, she beheld the babe a stiffened corpse! with its eyes glaring upon the other end of the bed, in which she found pinned by the maid the hobgoblin which produced this terrific result!

Such is Popery! Such the quietude that it produces! Such the sobriety of Father Mathew, which draws forth endless laudations from Protestant journals, and has poured out the gold of an "enlightened community" upon the "great and good apostle of temperance." And it is for the purpose of working out such a principle that Sir Robert Peel and his ministry have appropriated for ever an annual sum of £30,000 of the national treasure. That sum is to be lavished in order to raise a perpetual supply, not indeed of children's maids, such as the above, but of old wives' priests, elaborately instructed in the manufacture of hobgoblins, to alarm and subdue the national mind of Ireland; to terrify it with frightful pictures of worlds that have no existence, in order, among other consequences, to be able thereby to levy weighty contributions upon the sick and dying. That the success of the scheme should reduce to beggary multitudes of those who depended on them, is, perhaps, regarded by the Prime Minister as an enhancement of the wisdom of his policy.

For my part, I say, give me my children unterrified by false alarms; let me have them "as bold as brass," rather than reduced into order by the operation of any instrumentality, save that which will inform their understandings and convert their hearts. And, to apply the case, give me a thousand times rather a population of drunkards, with their lucid intervals, in which I might employ upon them those influences of reason and religion on which I could invoke a blessing, than a population paralysed by the charm of a priest's touch, and supposing that the devil would take them if they hesitated to believe that the "apostle" who bewitched them could strike them stiff if they violated their engagement towards him. Well may Holy Writ pronounce the dread denunciation, "The Lord God hath sworn by himself, saith the Lord the God of Hosts, I abhor the excellency of Jacob." (Amos vi. 8.)

I repeat, Popery is worked out in Popish countries, and the working of it out suggests the idea of the working out of the truly Catholic system of our establishment. Apply the picture of Italy which I have drawn, with the necessary changes, to this Protestant realm. Multiply places of worship; let the way-worn traveller see the sanctuary open; let him be encouraged to walk within, and on bended knees worship

Him that is a Spirit, in spirit and in truth. Let the page of inspiration be displayed before his eyes, and let him hear the gracious call, "Come unto me, ye weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Let missionaries of the Gospel supplant officers of the law, and an open Bible from lips of truth pour light and knowledge upon those who sit in darkness and the shadow of death. Let religious assemblages be increased a thousand fold; let there be as many working clergy to instruct amongst us as there are begging friars to deceive in Italy. Let the government be at as much expense to display the doctrines of truth through our highways and our byways as the government of Italy are to set up images and to provide them with candles. Let our queen, her consort, and her ennobled subjects, her dukes, her marquises and barons, her judges, sheriffs and councillors, her learned men, her industrious traders, her ingenious artizans, commingled with the finest peasantry in the world, meet in monster gatherings, where all would be order, decorum, and propriety. Let the worship of the united population, high and low, rich and poor, young men and maidens, old men and children, be offered, uncontaminated by Popish corruptions, to the High and Holy One. Let the homily which reaches the ears of the inner circles be circulated in print for the benefit of all. In one word, let the English system be worked out. Truth and holiness are its essence; enlightenment and wisdom its inevitable accompaniments; its results would be the disappearance of vice, the prevalence of virtue, the happiness of the people; liberty would more than ever abound; the classes would be gradually approximated, in feelings and sympathies at least. Higher and lower, we still should have, together with comparatively rich and poor; but the rich would be liberal and the poor contented; the rich would still be able to accomplish great things; the poor, however, would not be left to pine, nor treated as they are under the infamous and detestable poor law system. "The altar, the throne, and the cottage" would flourish together; holiness would beautify the first; the ermine adorn the second; while sweet-scented jessamine and the climbing honeysuckle, mingled with the beauty of the rose and the grace of the fuchsia, adorning the cottage of the peasant, would bespeak the peace and plenty that rewarded the Bible-reading inmates. I repeat, again and again, Protestantism never has been worked out.

Can anything, then, be more absurd than to cry down the efforts of religious men to force upon the attention of our rulers the important effect that true religion would have upon the welfare of the community, upon the ground that such efforts would assimilate them to the political priests of the apostate church, or to the political demagogues who are occupied in the promotion of her interests? Nothing in the world can be more absurd; it verges very closely upon the criminal; it must be scouted by the whole community; it must be denounced with a vehemence proportional to its disastrous effects upon the public welfare. Not merely should religious men interfere in order to operate upon the general policy of the government, but there should not be

one single case of individual wrong or injustice that should not draw out into the expression of indignation the whole Christian population. They should not wait till a worthy man is victimised, or a rich man, or one of high estate, they should rally round the humblest brother whom the hand of power might unjustly strike down. And, above all others, the clergy should be foremost in the work. Is not the protection of the sheep a principal function of the shepherd? What is the description our Master gives of him who flees when the wolf cometh? Why, that he is a hireling and not a shepherd. Say that the bishops would wish to interfere with the clergy in this matter, to forbid the performance of the duty which I urge. Why, then, the clergyman should respectfully tell the bishop that he was overstepping his prerogative; that they did not cease to be citizens when they were ordained clergy; that though the Church of Rome compelled those who were entering into holy orders to place their hands, bound round with cloths, within the hands of their bishops, thus signifying that their every act was to be controlled by their superiors, true Catholic ministers made no such surrender of the liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free; that bishops were not to be lords over God's heritage, but ensamples to the flock. The clergy, if attempts were made for the invasion of their liberties, should thus act, and trust to their rectitude and to sound public opinion—they should trust to God himself to maintain their cause. There is no individual who abominates more than I do, clerical disobedience or insubordination; but clerical subserviency is quite as bad. I speak as a beneficed clergyman, as one having a stake in the church; and this I say, that as I would not break in upon the rights of my superiors, so would I prevent them from invading mine.

In England the disposition is, to stand up for the weak against the strong; in this country, to join with the strong and discountenance the weak. I recollect one day when I was called upon to perform the funeral service in Sheffield, on approaching the churchyard, I found the gates closed, and these with the railings beset by an excited multitude. The crowd was composed in the main of women, carrying infants in their arms, and attended by children of all sorts and sizes, who, by their noisy exclamations and the anxiety which they displayed, seemed to take as great an interest in what was going forward as their elders. There were a few working men with their paper caps and upturned sleeves through the crowd, who, while they did not appear so much excited as the rest, evidently regarded with satisfaction the rage of the women, and were disposed to urge them on. I heard dropped words of the deepest execration, and viewed with no small curiosity, without knowing what the cause was, the evidences of pent-up passion which displayed themselves. I passed through the crowd without exciting the slightest attention, for every eye seemed strained in order to penetrate, if possible, the church doors. The sexton, seeing this state of things without, had locked the gates of the churchyard, and, upon admitting me, was evidently quite in the dark as to the origin of

the excitement. At the church-door were two respectable carriages, and, in the usual place, inside the building, lay the coffin. Those who attended it to the grave were two highly respectable-looking females, dressed in deep mourning, with those black silk hoods which are employed in England on such occasions, all indicating competence and superiority. There may have been a few additional persons attending the funeral, but those described were the chief; and both during the service in the church, and subsequently in the churchyard, I had an opportunity of observing that the countenances of the females were exceedingly mild and pleasing. They seemed to be labouring under the influence of alarm, although there was a distinct effort on their part to appear perfectly calm. The service at the grave was marked by a total absence of anything resembling disturbance. When, however, it was over, as I drew near to the palisades, I perceived that the crowd had considerably increased in multitude; its murmurs became louder—though they were not loud, but deep—as the females approached; but when they had entered their carriages with their few friends, and issued from the gates of the cemetery, then it was that the fury of the mob came to its height; still it went no further than expression, and the women took the lead in it. They rushed up to the coach windows; hundreds of clenched fists were directed at the females, while language of the most appalling denunciation invoked upon them the wrath of Heaven; every species of opprobrious epithet was discharged upon their heads by some, while others of the furious dames insultingly spat at the windows of the vehicle. “Well, what is all this about?” said I to a group, who seemed like myself to be unacquainted with the ground of the disturbance, but who were drinking in information from a stalwart operative, that appeared to think it all a capital joke. He at once turned round at my question, and informed me that the body which I had buried was that of the mother of these two young women; that the idea had got abroad from the information of the neighbours, that she had not been kindly dealt with by her daughters; that, in fact, they had been undutiful children, and made her last hours anything but easy; and it was these circumstances which produced the explosion that I witnessed. It was quite plain that it was the object of the angry mothers to mark their indignation with respect to the unnatural conduct of the parties principally concerned. I am sure they were far from contemplating the production of a moral impression upon the public mind. They designed nothing of the sort; honest feeling and sympathy prompted their conduct so far as it was violent; a respect for the sanctions of the law kept it within legal bounds, if, indeed, severely considered, it may not be supposed that those bounds were transgressed; the transgression, however, was not of that sort likely to call forth the activities of the officers of justice; no bones were broken; a salutary lesson was only taught to all, without detriment to any concerned.

I trust I may be excused for putting the facts on record; while there

was much, I admit, that was culpable connected with them, they illustrate the workings of a sound public opinion, a violence under control, and operating for the production of respect for the sanctions of domestic charity and scriptural religion. I had never seen anything parallel to it in Ireland; and I was particularly struck with the marks of intelligence and feeling—both existing in a very high degree—which were stamped upon the countenances of this English mob.

In England the battle of justice and of liberty is frequently fought over the person of the worthless and the vile. It requires the sacrifice of noble victims in Ireland to arouse Protestant indignation, and when aroused it is too often lulled again and produces no effect. All England rallied round the person of Stockdale, a publisher of immoral books, because it was thought that liberty was endangered by the way in which he was treated. The prosecutions that were carried on against Carlile, the infidel bookseller, almost made his fortune, and invested him with the character of a hero. And to look back to a more remote period, the attempt to crush John Wilkes, one of the vilest of characters, drew forth towards him the sympathies of the entire English people, and exalted him to the rank of a national idol. The severity that was practised towards Queen Caroline—who, to speak in the most favourable terms, was a highly imprudent person—nearly cost the British monarch his crown. But in Ireland, the fact of being ill-treated by the authorities seems to be regarded as a warrant for the public disregard; and the result is, that these authorities are hardened into something of a contempt for the just remonstrances of the injured, or of their friends, and, through hope of impunity, encouraged to the gratification of their own caprices and dislikes, however unjustifiable these may be. We look upon the victim; with a shrug of the shoulders we pronounce him an unfortunate creature, and we pass by on the other side. The feeling of each individual seems to be, that the persecution of another is no business of his, and that therefore he is not called upon to meddle in it; whereas, the fact of his having a *right* to meddle in it, the mere circumstance of the Government and the Legislature being bound by the constitution to give a respectful attention to the complaint of every one, completely negatives the plea of indifference, and renders the man who looks tamely upon wrong in some sort a participator in it.

Most earnestly do I hope that my fellow-Protestants may fling off this apathy; may take a thoughtful and a prayerful view of their responsibilities, reflect upon the consequences of their neglect, and resolve that it shall be put an end to. The day when they come to this resolution will indeed be a great one for Ireland.

This much they may rely upon, that so long as the Papists are suffered to occupy places of authority, there will be abundant occasion for the public spirit of Protestants. Popery is such a rotten system, that it feels itself shaken by the slightest possible attack. Hence it is the object of Papists in authority to gag the mouths of Protestants,

and to visit with the severest penalty every individual of the number who is not a confirmed latitudinarian. The Tom Steeles, the George Roes, the Richard Barretts, and the Lord Mayor Arabins, are the type of the only Protestants whom Papists can look upon with favour. To compel all Protestants, therefore, in subordinate offices, to utter indifference, is the object of Papists in high places; and in this object they find themselves abundantly countenanced by the despicable creatures, miscalled Protestants, whom the existing state of our over-tuned constitution admits to power.

A rule which prevails amongst the metropolitan police, one of the commissioners of which force is most improperly an idolater, illustrates the position which I have laid down. The rule is found in the book of instruction, and is as follows:—"He" (that is, each policeman who enters the force) "shall, while in the service, refrain from making use of any expression, political or religious, calculated to give offence."

The slightest consideration will show the oppressive use which may be made of this apparently innocent rule. A man observes, "Idolatry must be the curse of any country." Can anything be more proper than that those entrusted with British power should hold this opinion, and, holding it, express it? It may be pronounced, however, "calculated to give offence;" and therefore the individual who uses it is held guilty of high crime and misdemeanour. A policeman observes, "It is very improper that temperance bands should break the Sabbath day by their parading;" or, "It is quite improper that Mr. O'Connell should hold his Repeal meetings on Sundays;" or, "What vast benefits would arise, should all the population diligently study the Word of God!" Here are political and religious sentiments which a Roman Catholic commissioner would unquestionably adjudge "calculated to give offence" and the employment of which would indicate a temper of mind at variance with the Tom Steele standard, and consequently to be put away as soon as possible. Should the expression "calculated to give offence" not be sufficiently glaring to justify speedy execution, the individual suffers nothing openly but a reprimand; he is, however, noted down in the innermost breast of our commissioner—whose mind is well understood, even without a hint, by hundreds of dark bigots who become acquainted with the circumstance—as a black sheep; and it may be set down as a matter of certainty, that, if the man were an angel in point of conduct, ways and means will be found to sacrifice him. Now why should the law suffer the existence of any such Algerine regulation at all? I am convinced that every Protestant in the force would most cordially assent to the establishment of a very different rule: for example—"that any Protestant policeman who takes offence at any religious or political observation of a Roman Catholic, shall be instantly dismissed." He must be a contemptible Protestant who could take offence at anything a Roman Catholic or any one else could say against his religion. The real fact is, that no sensible man whose religion is based on truth and on the Scriptures, can be offended by an observation against it. If one speak truth of

such a religion it must be creditable ; if he speak falsely, the exhibition of the falsehood is more than ample satisfaction for its utterance ; and if he speak in the mere way of vulgar insult, he renders himself indeed despicable ; and he must be a pitiful Protestant that could not make this apparent. Protestants, therefore, would no doubt be quite willing to see blockheads of their number, who might take offence at the observations of Roman Catholics, drummed out of the force ; and when they would admit such a rule as I have supposed, it may well be conceived that they have no necessity for that which is really in existence. Why then is that rule established ? For the mere protection of the baseless, if not tottering, Popish system. It literally amounts to this : " each Protestant policeman, while in the service, shall refrain from hinting that the Roman Catholic system is false in principle, or absurd in any of its details ; or from stating that he believes Protestantism to be the true system of Christian religion." This is the real gist of the rule. It is, under the colour of impartial liberality, a mere gag for Protestant mouths ; a criterion whereby obnoxious individuals may be discovered, marked out, and doomed for vengeance ; the force thus gradually " weeded of Protestants," and rendered essentially, if not altogether, Popish.

I dwell the more emphatically upon this, because I know it to have been made the instrument of heaping distress upon very many worthy men, and of thus bringing want and weakness into the Protestant body.

It has also operated for the gradual papalising of the force itself ; and thus for the production within it of a bigoted and intolerant feeling, which renders it extremely distasteful to such of its members as have anything of the genuine Protestant spirit. Perhaps, however, this may be thought a small evil ; perhaps for a few years longer it may seem anything but matter for serious concern, that the safe keeping of the metropolis should be mainly depending upon Popish loyalty ; when, however, that moment arrives which Mr. O'Connell alludes to in his oft-repeated declaration, that " the Repealers will bide their time "—that moment fraught with disasters which national unfaithfulness has treasured up—when clouds, darkness, and tempest, providentially wielded, will blind the eyes and baffle the force of Britain, then it will be found that the lodging of our securities in the hands of our enemies, was not just the course that prudence would have recommended.

Very frequently the grievance does not consist in unmixed injustice. The oppressive functionary has a colour for his conduct ; he can advance a pretext which, through want of public spirit, satisfies the community, and quells the discontent that too gross a case might elicit. We forget, or seem ignorant of a proverb of the ancients, to wit—*summum jus, summa injuria* ; that is to say, the height of justice is the height of injustice. If the administration of justice be not tempered with mercy, it may constitute downright tyranny. Men are only men, and not angels ; and if, through want of due consideration for the infirmities of human nature, and the deficiencies of human

wisdom, they are to be visited with extreme punishment, abundant indeed will be the victims. The Protestant public should not be content with mere justice, or with something or other that may with a good deal of contrivance be brought to bear the colour of it; they should insist on the proper combination of mercy with judgment; they should demand for their brethren a due allowance for their merely human nature; and if they find this disregarded, they should at least give those in high places the pain of finding their harshness properly denounced.

I must return to the case of John Flint. Here was a man summoned from his bed, after a season of weariness and anxiety, to the presence of a Roman Catholic commissioner, and upon a charge which was soon after admitted to be utterly false and groundless. If he denied the charge with a feeling of indignation, would it be to be wondered at? If he were then told, that he must submit to have his apartments, in which he had left his wife sick and his child dying, searched for papers, and that in his absence and immediately,—would it be to be wondered at that there should be sudden exasperation, and a hasty expression of it? It should be known that this respectable Protestant had been for nearly twenty years a tried and trusted man. And, suppose that, under the influence of a throbbing indignation, stung with a sense of unmerited wrong, he uttered language that was neither quite cool nor quite correct, would it be right to disregard the concurrent circumstances, to forget what the nature of man was, and to visit a transient indiscretion, not with the forfeiture of a few days' pay, or the infliction of some other temporary punishment, but—with total ruin! The man was dismissed—although he had nearly completed the term which would have entitled him to a pension, this was not taken into account—without a penny compensation; although his whole career had entitled him to the approbation of his superiors—he was flung upon the wide world, with a damaged character, to commence life anew, to seek for an immediate subsistence through the sympathy of his friends, until Providence should kindly open a door whereby he might obtain bread for himself and his family.

The state of the public mind which could look tamely upon the perpetration of so grievous a wrong, is lamentable. My desire would be to make this conviction general; to induce every one of my readers to say for himself, "I will be apathetic in such cases no more." I very earnestly request attention to the following extract from a memorial adopted on the 31st of October, 1844, at their weekly meeting, by the Dublin Protestant Operative Association and Reformation Society.

We have heard, may it please your excellency, with the deepest sympathy, the heart-afflicting narrative of John Flint, late acting inspector of the E division of the metropolitan police; and it would be quite impossible that we could convey to your excellency a sense of the astonishment and indignation which that narrative has created in our breasts. Here is a man, after a long and creditable service of nearly twenty years, brought up upon a false charge, and deprived of all the benefits

of an established character and useful life by a harsh and arbitrary decision, and at a moment when peculiar tenderness and pity were called for towards him. We will not fatigue your excellency by recapitulating the facts, for we know that Flint's memorial has put you in possession of them; but this we would respectfully venture to say, that robbery and murder at the hands of the common felon, would be preferable to the ruin inflicted upon character and property under the colour of legal authority; and which, while it was in fact disgraceful to the author, would appear to the public eye as entailing merited calamity and disgrace upon the victim.

It is our firm conviction, may it please your excellency, that Flint is the victim of a bigoted hatred to the Protestant faith. We believe also that it will be found that it has been no unusual thing to curry favour with those high in office, by exhibiting savings to the public purse by the unscrupulous dismissal of those whose services had given them a claim on it, and to get rid of such claims by conveniently picking a quarrel with the claimants. We do not hesitate to tell your excellency that an opinion such as this is prevalent among those who have suffered from the system. We believe also, may it please your excellency, that there has been one measure of mercy for members of the Roman Catholic sect, and quite another for the members of the Established Church of Ireland. Considering, therefore, that Flint has suffered from a system, we regard it as of immense importance that that system should be exploded and its agents visited with condign retribution.

We respectfully lay before your excellency the following cases, well authenticated, which have come to our knowledge. As the parties concerned are of the same rank as ourselves, their cases have afforded us intense interest, and we have reason to think that they are not a tithe of what accurate investigation would disclose. These cases will show your excellency that there is one measure of justice for Protestants—another for Romanists; that the slightest expressions in reference to Popery have been visited as criminal and as deserving of the destitution which dismissal involves, whilst no such extreme punishment has been imposed on delinquents on the other side.

We, may it please your excellency, altogether disapprove of any punishment at all for any religious reflections on the one side or the other; our religion defies reflection; but, when an objectionable riddle exists, it should at least be equitably carried out.

Sergeant Johnson, of the D division, an estimable officer—who, at other times, and on the 9th August, 1838, received the especial thanks of the commissioners for special services, the commissioners putting it on record that “the establishment was indebted to him”—was, in 1839, compelled to resign for jocosely using the common expression, in the kitchen of Glasnevin station, where, on a Friday, the men were quarrelling about a frying-pan, “Boys, sure you have not all the Pope in your belly?”

In 1838, Wm. Humphries, E division, was brought before the commissioners by a Roman Catholic sergeant, at the instance of a Roman Catholic superintendent, for dirty buttons, and was dismissed for saying “That a Protestant had no chance in the force;” whilst in July, 1839, Acting-sergeant Nowlan, who, when brought before the commissioners, not for ‘dirty buttons,’ but for being drunk in the station house and saying, “He was watched because he was a Roman Catholic,” was merely reduced to the rank of first-class constable, and fined a pound. He was not turned adrift to want and destitution. Why should a Protestant suffer all this for a lesser fault? Though found drunk Humphries was retained; whilst in May, 1844, Inspector Mills, a Protestant, was dismissed for being under the influence of liquor at Frederick-street station-house; and three sergeants, viz., Bible, Stuart, and Magee, were dismissed for not reporting him, they being Protestants, although a Roman Catholic inspector, M'Mahon, had seen him in a like condition, and did not report him, and yet was retained, although charged with the fact.

Sergeant Peacock, for six years divisional clerk, a man of most unblemished character and conduct, was dismissed, because, in plain clothes, he, when off duty, attended a Protestant tea party, which was no violation of the rules of the police.

The slightest fault was never found with him during his entire service, and a sum of not less than one hundred thousand pounds was disbursed by him without the least inaccuracy ; whilst a Roman Catholic constable, named Evans, still in the force, was brought up for having attended in uniform a repeal meeting in New-market, by a constable named Wildridge : and this man was only cautioned and sent to his duty. And again, another Roman Catholic constable, named Whitehead, was charged with having made use of violently offensive language against Protestants in one of the kitchens in Kevin-street Barracks, by a constable named Henniker ; he was dismissed for the offence, and was reinstated in a month in the D division ; and is now Acting-sergeant in the A division. And furthermore, a Roman Catholic, on the 16th August, 1839, when off duty and in plain clothes, got drunk, and was carried by the police to the Clarendon-street station-house, when informations for an assault were sworn against him. This man's offence was noted in the minute-book as "indiscretion when off duty." He was fined 10*l.*, but in six months afterwards promoted to 1*l.* 15*s.* weekly ; whilst Peacock, for a slighter "indiscretion," was deprived of bread altogether. Was this just or equal ?

On August 14, 1841, police-constable Michael Fenton, a Protestant, was reported by a Roman Catholic inspector for being under the influence of liquor when on duty. He was dismissed.

A Roman Catholic of the detective force, and under the same inspector, was found drunk in the street, and carried to the station-house on the stretcher. This man was not deprived of bread ; he was only fined 2*l.*

Sergeant Pollock, D division, was returned unfit for service, though he never was in greater vigour, and had served twenty-two years without being a day absent on sick leave. For this long service he only got 30*l.* compensation money on his dismissal.

While Inspector Plunket, a Roman Catholic, was on the sick list three times in 1843, and was on sick leave nine months in '43-'44, on full pay of 1*l.* 12*s.* a week. He still is continued in the service, although he cannot patrol his division. And Roman Catholic Sergeant Daly, D division, for four years' service received a dismissal compensation of 28*l.*, after three months' leave of absence ; and was, after his dismissal, re-employed as a warrant collector, at 1*l.* 1*s.* a week. What a contrast to Protestant Pollock's treatment ! But, may it please your excellency, Daly was tenant's son to Mr. O'Ferrall's agent. This, may it please your excellency, can be proved.

Wm. Coulter, a man at this moment able for any duty, however severe, was in July, 1838, six years ago dismissed as unfit, without a penny compensation for sixteen years' service ; and he had also been wounded in the performance of his duties ; but, alas ! he was a voter in Dublin and Drogheda, and had been guilty of supporting, at some time or other, the Conservative candidates.

A Roman Catholic (87 B) was, in 1839, brought before the commissioner for opprobriously calling police-constable 153, "a Protestant blackguard." He was let off with a fine of five shillings, and afterwards promoted to be Acting-sergeant.

These facts, may it please your excellency, are of a very striking character, and calculated to confirm the view which Flint gave hasty expression to. Hence it would appear, that feelings of enmity to the Protestant religion have wrought for the detriment of Flint and others ; that they have biassed the mind of the Roman Catholic commissioner, and warped his judgment. We cannot think that an individual who has acted in such a way is fit to be entrusted with public authority. We do, therefore, most respectfully supplicate your excellency to do justice in this urgent case by reinstating, if his facts be proved, Acting-inspector Flint, and forthwith dismissing Mr. Commissioner O'Ferrall ; and for this gracious act of mercy and justice, we, for your excellency's health, long life, and happiness, will ever pray.

This memorial was transmitted to his excellency early in the following month, with a statement that "the memorialists were prepared to establish the validity of the several items of their complaint, and to

bring forward other cases not particularised in the memorial." The following official reply, addressed to the secretary of the association, was published in the newspapers :—

Viceregal Lodge, Nov. 14, 1844.

SIR,—I am directed by the lord lieutenant to acknowledge the receipt of a memorial, forwarded by you from the Dublin Protestant Operative Association, praying that John Flint, late a constable in the metropolitan police, may be reinstated in that force ; and I am further directed to acquaint you that his excellency, having inquired into the circumstances of the case, is of opinion that the commissioners, in dismissing John Flint, exercised with propriety the authority vested in them.—I am, sir, your obedient servant,
 Wm. C. Espy, Esq., 5, College-street.

C. H. W. A'Court, Private Sec.

What could have been more unsatisfactory than this reply? The memorialists complained of systematic tyranny. While they dwelt especially upon the case of Flint, they adduced numerous additional instances of the wrong which they remonstrated against. All this, however, was disregarded by the lord lieutenant ; the additional cases were not as much as referred to ; and the contentment of his excellency with the conduct of the commissioners, or rather, indeed, of the commissioner—for it was the idolater alone whose conduct was impugned—was given as a reason for placing a negative on the prayer of the memorialists. They were informed that the lord lieutenant had "inquired into the circumstances of the case," and that he had thus arrived at the "opinion that the commissioners, in dismissing John Flint, had exercised with propriety the authority vested in them." But whom had he inquired from? Why, from the party implicated ; for there was no public investigation instituted into the case ; there was no confronting of the complainant, Flint, with the individual who injured him ; no opportunity afforded to that complainant of eliciting the truth through the assistance of counsel, and through the cross-examination of the party or parties opposed to him ; but after an *ex-parte* one-sided inquiry the ruin of a worthy man was pronounced commendable, and a screen effectually thrown over the head of the oppressor.

I, for my part, did not at all wonder at this. It was the system. It was the way the thing worked ; but I mourned and lamented that the publication of the facts should have been totally without effect ; that the announcement of this afflicting case—indeed, I may say, of a whole leash of cases—of systematised injury, should not have moved the slightest possible amount of useful indignation. I certainly heard numerous individuals express their sympathy with the sufferers ; declare that it was very melancholy that there should be such doings in high places ; but there were no public meetings ; there was, in fact, nothing done.

In England the whole press would have been engaged on the subject ; there would have been replies from the commissioners, there would have been rejoinders on the other side, there would have been an approximation to a knowledge of the real state of the case, and

ultimately the evil complained of would have been redressed; but here the thing was still-born—it excited some pity, and then fell to the ground. Can anything illustrate in a more lively manner the painful results of want of public spirit amongst Irish Protestants?

Had the aggrieved individual been a Roman Catholic, had the aggressor been a Protestant, would the matter have been allowed to drop as it did? No. The whole Roman Catholic press would have set up a chorus of complaint; the whole Roman Catholic community would have enlisted itself on behalf of the sufferer, and a commission of inquiry would have been instituted, although it might have involved expensive journeyings to the remotest part of the island. The ears of his excellency would have been warmed by many a scolding from some bristling priest; and, if necessary, hundreds of pounds would have been forthcoming to carry on the war; but in the case of the poor Protestant there was nothing but apathy and neglect. He received at the hands of his brethren in the faith words of sympathy indeed; but he was compelled to witness in act the most contemptible subserviency.

How it happens that the Roman Catholics of Ireland should not be chargeable with that want of public spirit which I deplore on the side of Protestants, must be treated of at some length hereafter.

And here I cannot help remarking upon the conduct of the Protestant press in reference to this particular case. As I said before, the *Warder* took it up, so did the *Statesman*. These papers published all the documents, gave the reports of the meetings of the Protestant Operative Association in which the grievance was dwelt upon, and made some spirited comments upon the transaction. The *Packet*—the understood organ of the government—naturally enough, excluded that which inculcated the authorities; and the *Mail*, the organ of the aristocracy, never gave a line on the subject!!! If I were asked to give my opinion as to the cause of the depression that afflicts the Protestants of Ireland, I should say that it is amply explained in the popularity of this contemptible journal, the *Mail*; a journal which would not exist six weeks, if the Protestants of Ireland were animated by a proper public spirit. Well may the Protestants be prostrated in the earth, despised by their enemies, and neglected by the government, when the *Mail* is allowed to be the organ that represents them.

The ordinary idea of a newspaper is, that it is an organ of public intelligence, a journal of public transactions, on which transactions the editor is supposed to make his own comments, to approve or to condemn, as to his judgment may seem good.

It is not the just prerogative of any journal to suppress facts. To suppress facts, if they have a bearing upon the general welfare, is to mislead the public and to bring detriment upon the general interests. I should say that a public journal should afford an express image of the times; should present to all parties an opportunity of knowing accurately what the public was about; and I am sure all will agree with me in saying that it is the duty of a Protestant journal, industriously, diligently, and carefully, to make known the proceedings of

the Protestant body, and more especially the proceedings of that body which are carried on in his locality. I trust that the time is coming upon Ireland, when, what I am going to put on record—and it will live—will scarcely be believed, to wit: that the Protestant democracy of the Irish metropolis—a democracy comprising a vast amount of worth and intelligence, consisting of thousands of Bible-reading, serious, God-fearing men—in order that they might publicly assert their rights, promulgate their views, and conciliate public feeling towards their principles, constructed in the year 1841, an association in Dublin; and by vast exertion, and with no inconsiderable outlay, worked it effectually to the time at which I now write, the autumn of 1845; and that the *Evening Mail*, boasting itself to be *par excellence*, the Protestant organ of Ireland, systematically excluded from its columns the proceedings of that body. The association was formed in no hole and corner manner, but in a general meeting of the Protestants of Dublin convened with the most public possible notice. From the outset a number of the most respectable clergymen and citizens of Dublin were its avowed patrons. A considerable number of members of parliament were its acknowledged presidents. Its proceedings, which were ever carried on with open doors, consisted in resolutions that were adopted, and speeches in support of them, together with petitions, memorials, and addresses to the crown, the Legislature, and individuals of eminence, most of which elicited interesting answers: and by their publication in other journals, operated a considerable effect upon the mind of the community; and yet the *Mail* scornfully rejected the whole, thus treating the mass of the Protestants of Dublin as a non-entity! and that, while that journal uniformly published the proceedings of the Popish Repeal Association.

To judge from the *Evening Mail*, it might have been supposed that there did not exist in the capital of Ireland, or indeed in the whole kingdom, a Protestant body animated with sufficient spirit to stand up for Protestant truth. Is it any wonder that Sir Robert Peel, in the consideration of such a state of things, should have imagined himself driven by an inevitable necessity to the making of those concessions with respect to Maynooth College, which have prepared the way for putting the topstone upon the work that his unprincipled conduct has effected in this country?

There can be no doubt but that Sir Robert Peel heard often enough about the labours of the Protestant Operative Associations, in Dublin and elsewhere. These bodies frequently addressed him as an individual, and their petitions were not unfrequently brought before his attention in Parliament. Is it unnatural, however, that he should have argued thus: "Why should I regard the remonstrances of a body which is not thought worthy of notice by the organ of the Protestants of Ireland? Why should I attend to the petitions of thousands, whose voice the journal of the Irish aristocracy habitually refuses to acknowledge the sound of?" Such reasonings seem to have been almost inevitable: we are now reaping their disastrous results.

Perhaps the *Evening Mail* thought itself called upon to exclude me as an individual from notice; perhaps its managers thought me undeserving of the influence that I enjoyed; that a person so little distinguished by birth or fortune was unentitled to be a leader among Protestants (for I am not aware that I gave them cause for personal offence); this may have been so, but it afforded no manner of warrant whatsoever for having treated even the humblest class of the Protestant citizens of Dublin with disregard.

I think it a sound opinion, that he who interferes with public matters should carefully avoid being led away by prejudice, whether groundless or otherwise. Justice should be done irrespectively of such considerations. If paltry jealousy be allowed to interpose, it shows that he who entertains it is altogether out of his place; that he wants enlargement of soul to constitute him a useful public man. If any such feeling operated in the case that I have just spoken of, it is little wonder, with such narrow-mindedness in an influential post, that we have suffered as we have done.

That the managers of the *Evening Mail* were not above it, will be obvious from a very simple fact. No doubt those who were concerned in the observation may have noticed that this same large-minded journal has, for a great length of time past, excluded from its columns every speech—no matter how interesting may have been the occasion of its delivery—of our distinguished fellow-citizen, Isaac Butt, Q.C.; a man whose genius and power of eloquence, as well as the station which he has always occupied among his fellow-citizens, entitled him to general attention, as they have secured for him very general admiration. And why, think you, good reader, does he labour under the anathema of the *Evening Mail*? Because, forsooth, he was employed as counsel against that journal in a libel case, in which his public-spirited and excellent friend, John Jones, ex-sheriff, was plaintiff, and succeeded most justly in getting damages against the *Mail* to the extent of £500. For this reason, because Mr. Butt ably and successfully performed his duty to his client, he was doomed by the *Mail* to annihilation, and has ever since been "burked" by that journal as a public man. Now I venture to contend that this one single instance affords an abundant evidence of the pitiful spirit of rancour which governs the managers of "the leading Protestant journal of Ireland." I feel myself perfectly convinced that, until Irish Protestants scout with indignation, and visit with determined purpose, such contemptible narrow-mindedness, and brand, as unworthy of their countenance, the men that are actuated by it, they (the Protestants) will go on from bad to worse, until they entail upon their posterity almost incurable evils.

The *Evening Mail*, then, in the exercise of its power, excluded the reports of our meetings from its columns; and this, although our organisation was becoming every day more extensive, our power more unquestionable, so that at length we were able effectually to control every Protestant meeting in Dublin.

It may be well to give a practical instance of the arrogant spirit

with which the proprietor of that journal is swelled. Be it understood that the Association did not, as might perhaps be supposed, originally exhibit the slightest hostility to the *Mail*. It frequently solicited the co-operation of that journal by the publication of its proceedings. Its committee remonstrated by letter on several occasions, and always received civil replies, marked "private," but no compliance. So that the enmity displayed towards it can find no cloak in hostility, either expressed or entertained, by the Association, to the paper. However, the Association exerted its influence to effect a great meeting of the Protestant citizens of Dublin against the Maynooth grant, and at length, through the endeavour of its members, a requisition was set afloat, some influential names were attached to it, and a gentleman, who is a valuable member of the body, waited on the proprietor of the *Mail* to request that it might be allowed to lie at the office of that paper for additional signatures. This was conceded, and announced accordingly. A day was suffered to elapse, and a messenger called at the office to ascertain who had signed, when he was informed that the permission had been withdrawn, and that signatures would not be taken there! The original applicant waited on the proprietor to know the reason why, and he was thus addressed: "We will have no more Protestant meetings in Dublin! This will be a mere meeting of the operatives, and we cannot countenance it!" Having found it in vain to attempt to alter the decision, our friend bowed and retired. I confess, for my part, I was rather pleased with the circumstance, inasmuch as I was convinced that it would tend to show the *Mail* how small was the portion of power that it possessed in the metropolis—a result which the issue completely demonstrated. A more crowded or respectable meeting never was held, nor one which could more properly claim a large amount of great and powerful influence. One of the city members occupied the chair; a host of the clergy were in attendance; the intelligence of the city was present; and thence emanated the influential Irish anti-Maynooth movement, which powerfully drew the attention of the whole United Kingdom. The truth is, the *Mail* is utterly powerless in the metropolis. It has, indeed, an extensive rural circulation, but it could not produce in Dublin a meeting of sweeps, nor save from extinguishment and contempt a meeting of noblemen, if they were found infatuated enough to attempt in Dublin to get currency for such views as "their organ" tells us it reflects them in.

I think this detail will show that public spirit has a great deal to do in the business of journalism; and that we never can expect the Protestant cause to flourish, as it ought to do, until the Protestant body be fully, fairly, and justly treated by the organs which claim to give utterance to its sentiments. We have a glorious cause, the cause of Christian truth and Christian liberty; a cause, the foundations of which are laid upon the immovable rock of the Word of God; it is the business of every Protestant citizen to see that it receives no detriment, whether from the folly, the treachery, the incapacity, or the proppery affections of those who profess to labour for it.

I must say, while on this subject, that I cannot conceive what intelligible principle is the foundation upon which the *Mail* bases the policy that it advocates. It relinquishes the demands for Protestant ascendancy upon the ground of Protestant truth; it assents to the continuance of the Emancipation Act, and yet it clamours with angry paragraphs against Sir Robert Peel's policy. Why that policy is nothing more or less than a simple carrying out of the principle of '29. The act of that year recognises the claim of Roman Catholics to perfect equality with Protestants; it establishes the principle that the Roman Catholic religion affords no ground for civil incapacity. If that religion be not objectionable, why, in the name of common sense, should it not be taught at the public cost? If it be not objectionable, surely, since those who profess it are in the majority in this country, it is entitled to claim ascendancy here. This is evidently the opinion of the Prime Minister—an opinion which cannot be gainsaid by those who would oppose the repeal of the measure of '29. Let us not then deceive ourselves. Peel is acting in a manner which is perfectly consistent with his principle, and with the principle of every man who would not desire the repeal of the Emancipation Act; and he, no doubt, views with deserved scorn the inconsistent faction—for it deserves no better name, it is evidently governed by the merest party and place-hunting views—which clamours against him, as the *Mail* does, whilst, at the same time, in the profession of immense liberality, it declares that Roman Catholics are entitled to perfect equality with Protestants; and that it would rejoice to see the claim fully and freely allowed. I say, again and again, that Peel's present conduct is perfectly consistent with, and nothing more than a following out of, the emancipation policy.

I was lately speaking with my friend Richard Oastler, of Leeds, a truly good and large-minded man. While he has totally renounced all interference in political matters—his health does not admit it—he maintains unaltered all his views; indeed, derived as they are, like those of every other Christian man, from the Word of God, they are not only unaltered, but unalterable. I was deploring to him the conduct of the government with respect to Maynooth. This I did, not as mistaking its nature or its origin, but mourning it as an additional stage in that downward path to ruin which commenced with the treason of '29. That the government should give £26,000 a-year of the national money to propagate idolatry, I could not but regard as a pernicious step towards ultimate destruction. "I only lament," replied Oastler, "that they did not make their grant half a million: this would have been more consistent with the principle of '29. If the Roman Catholic religion, as a religion, be no disqualification, as that act implies, then it is gross injustice to refuse it ascendancy in Ireland, to delay the establishment of its church, and resist the repeal cry, which is raised by the vast majority of the 'qualified Christian citizens' of your country. Until the act of '29 be repealed, the more hastily the ruin which it involves is precipitated, the more speedily

may we hope to see all set to right again." Yes, Popery, because it is antagonistic to the constitution, must be eradicated from it. And until it be proved, in opposition to the declaration of the Holy Ghost, that rulers are sent for the praise of them that do ill, those whom the government selects for State honour and promotion, must be such as it can consistently regard as doing well.

How exceedingly this doctrine differs from that of the *Mail*, let the following extract prove. Speaking on the 18th of August (last month), as to the grounds upon which the government could justify the appointment of a Romanist to a principal situation in the Irish secretary's office, thus speaks "the organ of the Irish Protestants!" Is it any wonder that, with such "an organ," Irish Protestants should be "stuck in the mud?"

He is a Roman Catholic. This will be the first ground of justification. To this we reply, and cheerfully, it is no ground of disqualification; let the deserving Roman Catholics have in all things equal rights and privileges with their Protestant brothers; nay, if heretofore they have been deprived of their fair share of honours and emoluments, dispense to them now with even a more liberal hand than to the others till you have recompensed them for the deficiency. Such, we say, are the sentiments of true and loyal Protestants—such is the generous and brotherly spirit of those whom treacherous Conservatives (so called) have dared to stigmatise as a faction. We could, therefore—and so would the heads and leaders of the Protestant party, whose opinions we reflect—understand, ay, and receive with approbation and praise, an appointment made in this spirit by the selection of a Roman Catholic Conservative—a character always to be honoured, always to be supported, because, by his adherence to the constitutional principles of the land, he separates himself from the mass of his own party, he incurs odium, and is obnoxious to the suspicion of place-hunting and time-serving.

The policy which this extract indicates is that of a semi-Papist. Its root and spring are ignorance; nor would it be possible to collect one single great gathering of Protestants in Ireland, in which, if a "head" or a "leader" broached any such rotten sentiment, he would not be scouted as a traitor or laughed at as an ass. The "leaders," indeed, for whom the *Mail* speaks so confidently, may be quite willing to fraternise with Papists—bishops, priests, or nuns; but Protestant ascendancy is and ever will be the rallying cry of the Protestant masses. Protestant "managers" may, indeed, foist upon public meetings resolutions ill-heard, or rather not heard at all, flattering the talent and power of the *Mail*, and thus curry favour with those who write in its columns. And this may go down at a provincial assembly; but if it do, the *Mail* may rely on this, that it is to "management" they are indebted, and not to the voice of the people; and that even the managers would not presume to venture on such resolutions, save on the hypothesis that it was conducted on Protestant ascendancy principles. When the *Mail* receives the thanks of a metropolitan Protestant meeting it will have some reason to boast.

I trust that it will be believed that, in what I say upon the subject of Protestant ascendancy, I am animated by no unkindly feeling towards Roman Catholics. From my soul I wish them the greatest happiness that the world can afford; but I am too anxious to render

them real service to allow them to lie under the mistake, that Protestants do not regard themselves as in every respect in point of principle their superiors. We are lifted to an eminence immeasurably above them; and until they are taken out of the degrading system which sinks them beneath the level of the beasts that perish—for irrational as these are, they would not bow their head to stock or stone, they do not rebel against the laws that their Maker would govern them by—we will never cease to proclaim unto them that they are inferior, and that we repudiate the idea of admitting them to an equality with us. I would give them everything that I possibly could; everything which it was not wrong to bestow; but I never could consent to place them in a position where their blind spiritual ignorance and their sectarian bigotry must not only impede, but compel them to impede, every measure which an enlightened government could bring forward for the real amelioration of the people. The *beau ideal* of our constitutional system may be read in the preceding chapter; and even the slightest attention to the subject must show that it never can be carried out until persons unqualified for it are removed from the work of British legislation. It is an unquestionable fact, that one perverse individual may impede for ever the proceedings of a deliberative assembly. His madness, his folly, or his malignity, or all combined, may so disturb or exasperate the feelings of the rest, that until he be put out altogether no progress will be made. From the passage that I have referred to, it will be seen at once that *the promotion of Protestant truth and enlightenment ought to be the grand business of British legislation*; and when Roman Catholics can with any propriety be regarded as competent to the performance of that duty, then will it be plain that the blind are the most suited for opticians, and the deaf for performing in concerts of music. It is certainly excusable that both the leaders and the wheelers of the *Mail* should be slow to overtake the Protestant mind, that the proprietor of that paper should have but a twilight understanding of our principles; it is little wonder that he should display but small appreciation of Protestant liberty, and be prone to think that so weak an instrument as myself, and the Protestant tinkers and tailors, butchers and nailers, smiths, carpenters, and sailors, amongst whom I have laboured, are but, as Tom Steele would say, "a rascalion garbage," over whom he might swell with pride and upon whom he might trample with impunity; I think, however, he will learn by degrees that Protestants, even of the lowest order, cannot be slighted so easily as he may have been brought up to suppose. Indeed, I blame not the man so much as the want of public spirit which has led to the toleration of his injustice; which, although he arrogantly burked for four years the movement of the noble Protestant democracy of the Irish metropolis, allowed a considerable section of the Protestants of Ireland still to support his insolent presumption. I love a true convert from Popery; but one who shows an evident ignorance of either the spirit or the power of Protestantism, and a constant hankering after the commingling of

Papists and Protestants, shows that the work of conversion has not reached his soul.

When the *Evening Mail* rails against the pro-Popery policy of Peel, but acquiesces in the stability of the Emancipation Act—puts “Orange” in large capitals, but contends for the “perfect equality of Papists with Protestants;” he adopts a course quite consistent with the loftiest pretensions of the Church of Rome in Ireland. If the general of the Jesuits were consulted as to the best method of promoting Popery here, I think he would advise—“Get possession of ‘the Protestant organ,’ and let it profess the greatest hostility to our party as to our political objects, but always admit our religious capabilities—that our religion is no ground of disqualification; at the same time make much of all our movements, magnify their importance by keeping them ever before the public eye, while you simultaneously treat with contempt the efforts of Protestants, and call all who aim mortal blows at our political influence, ‘impracticables;’ denouncing them as the worst enemies of the Protestant cause. By acting thus, you will render us incalculable service, make an immense fortune for yourself, and be courted by the Protestant nobility and gentry of Ireland. Should any humble Protestant be trampled on by any member of our body, pass over his case without a word of notice; and when you have succeeded in demolishing any Protestant institution, then begin to express great regret at the circumstance, and to lay all the blame of the misfortune on the Protestants who defended it?” Who can doubt but that this would be the very wisest course the chief of the Jesuits could advise?

The want of public spirit among Irish Protestants would make it both safe and practicable.

CHAPTER V.

THE INFATUATION OF 1829 ILLUSTRATED, OF 1845 PROVED. INTER-
FERENCE IN POLITICS A SACRED OBLIGATION.

However, glorious is the work that is before us! Happy Protestants! Highly-favoured spirits! to whom the Lord omnipotent hath committed the task of flinging mountains into the sea; of remedying the evils which scores of years of faithlessness have originated, and of verifying the Word of God, “that when the enemy came in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord lifted up a standard against him!” Had not an infatuation as gross as that of Pharaoh beset the mind of England and the Protestants of Ireland, the idea of admitting Papists into Parliament could no more have possessed the nation, even to the extent

it did, than the idea that it was noontide at midnight could have possessed it.

How comes it, reader, think you, that when constituencies are electing members of parliament they do not elect the halt, the lame, and the blind? Among other reasons this is one: a gracious Providence has generally bestowed a certain share of modesty upon those who labour under such infirmities. If this modesty be wanted, and notwithstanding the workings of natural sense, such persons should come forward in great numbers to demand positions of eminence, the universal scorn which presumption is sure to elicit would obliterate those feelings of pity with which tenderness would regard the weak, and change the compassion, that would otherwise have engendered respect, into the loud laugh that was intended to rebuke vain pretensions. If natural feelings did not prevail to keep palpable "objects" out of parliament, no doubt law, and its operation in this respect would be very wholesome, would disqualify those whose presence would be obnoxious and whose views must necessarily be contracted.

Now be it remembered that sin—original sin—the fall of our first parents—has stamped upon the soul of man deformities which we have strong reason to believe are represented by those bodily diseases, corporal defects, and malformations which are visible to the outward eye. The eye of faith can discern the former just as distinctly as the outward eye the latter; and the Word of God amply instructs us that spiritual disorder is absolutely more pernicious and destructive—ininitely more injurious to society, as well as to the sufferer—than bodily defect or disease can possibly be. When our forefathers were wide awake, they with the vision of their soul perceived, and with their innermost feelings realized this truth; and for the good of their country and the welfare of their posterity they excluded by law moral imbeciles from the work of British government. Thank God! the Protestant public of the present day is at length beginning to awake from its slumber; and thousands of them realize with all the loathings of disgust, the filthy and wretched infidel and Popish cant which indicates the spiritual lepers—the maimed, and the blind, and the paralytic—who are now drawing down upon the empire disaster and confusion. I must endeavour to produce a sense of the horrors which the present proceedings of parliament really create in the Protestant breast.

Conceive the following fragment of a debate in parliament:—

The Right Hon. Perjure O'Blarney rose. The appearance of the right honourable gentleman was striking in the extreme, and made a vast impression on the House. He had an extraordinary large wen under his left ear, which was richly adorned with an emerald and Erin-go-bragh. He said that "he could not but feel hurt at the illiberality of the honourable member for Oxford, who had just sat down. A man was not the master of his own person; Nature, the bountiful goddess, did as she pleased with him. Could anything be more mon-

strous than to say that, because she had given him a peculiar conformation of parts, or a noble superabundance of flesh under one ear or the other, that he was therefore a less fitting object of regard? Perish the thought!" said the right honourable gentleman. "Ye powers that regulate human destiny! Virtue! Righteousness! come to my aid! Our principles are those of the ages of chivalry! Ours was Alfred; Richard of the lion heart, Langton, and Thomas à Becket were ours! Shall our lovely isle, its trees, rivers, and lakes, no longer be regarded? We are twenty-seven millions!" (Loud cheers.)

Mr. Daniel O'Slash, who was supported by a richly-ornamented crutch, and who carried a well-filled wallet suspended under his arm, followed on the same side. He denounced the bigotry that would found a disqualification for military privileges on peculiarities of person. A man could no more alter that conformation which he received at birth, which grew with his growth and strengthened with his strength, than he could the creed in which he was born and brought up. (Hear, hear.) If Christian charity did not govern their feelings, let them recollect that, thank Heaven, it was not in the power of unchristian malignity in these enlightened times to have its way. (Hear, hear.) He flung into their teeth his high and haughty defiance. (Loud cheers.) "Yes, in Ireland there are twelve millions of cripples, and I swear by the blood of the mighty O'Slash, my elevated ancestor," (here the honourable member energetically flourished his crutch,) "that unless we be seated on the shoulders of the Protestant population of Ireland, we will eat no English plum-pudding, wear no English clothes, and exclude English-made crutches, by a teetotal pledge, from the Irish market." (Tremendous cheers.)

Mr. Morgan O'Slash rose. He was remarkable for an extraordinary conformation of the neck, which raised his chin very much to an elevation above his right shoulder, whilst his left ear rested on the left shoulder, in which position it remained immoveable; his address wore an air of great hauteur. He would take the liberty of correcting his honourable relative who had spoken last. He had certainly overrated the number of cripples of his native land; but the Irish population had at least ten millions of blind men, who constituted the flower of the British army, and the most valiant of its marine force. (Oh, oh!) They were not just blind; they could see out of the corner of their left eye; and thus while they fought with equal ferocity as Protestants, they rushed with greater boldness into perils from which the others more scrutinizing shrunk, &c., &c., &c. (Loud cheers.)

Sir Rotten Peel, who evidently laboured under intense anxiety, and spoke under a nervous apprehension as to the magnitude of "the Irish difficulty," assured the honourable members on the other side that he would be the last to speak slightly of such peculiarities of person as they had alluded to. That House was not the place for doing so. (Loud cries of "Hear.") He admitted that, notwithstanding those peculiarities, the lame and the blind of Ireland were, in every respect, the equals of their brother Protestants, and should continue to enjoy the

privilege of admission to every situation under the crown, whether civil or military. He must, however, venture to add, that he could not as yet see an inevitable political necessity for placing them on the necks of the Protestant population. (Hear.)

Just at this time a tremendous hubbub was heard in the House. Richard Oastler, armed with an immense besom, and followed by multitudes of Protestant operatives, all carrying the same instruments, rushed in. We perceived the Reverends Dr. Croly, Hugh M'Neile, Hugh Stowell, and Tresham Gregg, endeavouring to restrain the impetuosity of the mob, and prevent them from breaking any heads with the handles of their besoms, a thing which they seemed bent on doing; however, we are happy to say that the efforts of the reverend gentlemen, (who quite approved of the main object intended, and indeed had been chiefly instrumental in bringing it about,) were as successful as could be wished. The House was swept clean in the twinkling of a broomstick. It was astonishing to see the velocity with which Daniel O'Slash employed his crutch. Notwithstanding the high head which young Morgan carried, he could scarcely overtake his father; but the Right Honourable Perjure O'Blarney distanced them all. An immense number of rats followed after Sir Rotten Peel; and after some fumigation, the House became once again sweet and wholesome.

Yes, until the Legislature of Great Britain be constructed with the express understanding that its primary function is the promotion of the happiness of the people, through the operation of moral causes, through the spread and influence of the Christian religion; until this be so, adieu to national virtue, national peace, or national prosperity. Since '29 the British State has been retrograding, marching back to darkness and bondage. Infidelity has been subverting the principles of the masses, demoralisation degrading their habits, and gaunt destitution laying waste their once happy homes; while, simultaneously, enormous wealth, mercilessly scraped together, has corrupted the higher classes of the manufacturing community, and rendered them, to a lamentable extent, mere infidel worshippers of Mammon. In fact, the corruption is general, and may be expected to draw down heavy judgments from on High.

Signs of the decay of principle, which led to this lamentable issue, were given when the first unprincipled concessions began to be made to Popery. I am far from being an advocate of the penal laws; but if it were sound principle which had abrogated them, it would, when it freed from penalty the persons of Papists, have carefully provided for the eradication of Popery. But it was latitudinarianism and infidelity, and not Christian charity, which were at work. These it was which originally gave the elective franchise to the bondslaves of the Popish priests, and made provision at Maynooth for the education of those priests themselves in idolatry and anti-Christian error. The pernicious leaven of irreligion was working from the reign of Anne; it wrought during the reigns of the three Georges, but it was not till Field Marshal

the Duke of Wellington gave the word—"Right about face—march!" in the 7th year of the reign of George IV., that the retrograde movement really began. Since then it has continued, and until a counter-movement take place, the national progress will be in the road to ruin; and any policy which does not commence with, or involve an abandonment of our downward career—a complete wheel-about to an upright course—will prove a mere make-shift policy, and do no manner of good.

I trust it may not be supposed, that in the caricature representation which I have above given of the spirit of parliamentary debates in the present day, I intend to indulge in vain satire, or to make a display of something that might be pronounced a pretension to wit, which in so serious a matter would be altogether misplaced. I conceive that I there spoke important verity—Christian verity—Scriptural verity—truth in parable.

There is no manner of doubt but that the Word of God represents disease as originally a consequence, and as frequently a judgment for sin. It gives us to understand, moreover, that the judgments thus inflicted are suitable in their nature, producing on the body effects analogous to those which sin inflicts upon the soul, and therefore it constantly speaks of the soul as labouring under disease and defects, such as blindness, madness, and so forth. When God was bringing his people into Canaan he gave them an assurance, that if they were obedient he would preserve them from the diseases of Egypt. "I will put none of these diseases upon thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians; for I am the Lord that healeth thee;" (Exodus xv. 26;) and *vice versa*, in case of disobedience, he says—"The Lord will bring upon thee all the diseases of Egypt, which thou art afraid of, and they shall cleave unto thee, till thou be destroyed." (Deut. xxviii. 60, 61.) And again (verses 28, 29,) "The Lord shall smite thee with madness, and blindness, and astonishment of heart. And thou shalt grope at noon-day, as the blind gropeth in darkness." When Christ healed the sick, he constantly coupled with the act the forgiveness of sins, using such words as, "Go, and sin no more, lest a worse thing befall thee;" thus indicating the close connexion between sin and bodily disorder. The woman that was bowed down with an infirmity, he declared to have been "bound by Satan, lo! these eighteen years." Moreover, he spoke of sin as being spiritual disease; for example, when he said, "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick." (Matt. ix. 12.)

The treatment for leprosy, which is prescribed at length in the thirteenth and fourteenth chapters of Leviticus, is understood by the church to have a spiritual meaning which is even more important than the literal one; and to indicate, in fact, that that disgusting disorder was a representation of the spiritual condition of the sinner. It is written in Ecclesiastes ix. 3, "The heart of the sons of men is full of evil, and madness is in their heart while they live;" in Hebrews xii. 13, "Make straight paths for your feet, lest that which is lame be

turned out of the way, but let it rather be healed;" meaning those who are crippled in their souls. Isaiah says, (xliii. 8,) "Bring forth the blind people that have eyes, and the deaf that have ears;" and Ezekiel, speaking of the ministers of God, employs the same figure at considerable length, (xxxiv. 4,) "The diseased have ye not strengthened, neither have ye healed that which was sick, neither have ye bound up that which was broken;" meaning those whose souls were diseased, sick, and broken. Our Lord calls the Pharisees, "fools and blind," "blind leaders of the blind." In short, the whole Scripture employs these figures so largely, that the adduction of all the examples would occupy a little volume in itself. The above, however, will suffice at present.

The Bible is also amazingly full on another point to which I have given some prominency. It distinctly lays it down, in numerous places, that numbers do not constitute strength; that so far from multiplied thousands or millions securing victory, if they contend against a righteous cause and a faithful people, they will only ensure defeat. "Ye shall chase your enemies, and they shall fall before you by the sword; and five of you shall chase an hundred, and an hundred of you shall put ten thousand to flight." (Lev. xxvi. 7, 8.) And the proportion is made still larger elsewhere. "Oh, that they were wise! How should one chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight, except their rock had sold them, and the Lord had shut them up?" (Deut. xxxii. 29, 30.) It is most interesting to read the charge which God gave to Joshua in the first chapter of the book of Joshua. The one single thing that he seems to impress upon him is, that he should "be strong and of a good courage," and that he should not allow the slightest atom of fear to grow out of a consideration for the multitude of his enemies. "Only be thou strong and very courageous." "Have not I commanded thee?" "Be strong, and of good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed, for the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest." A lesson which he acted upon with constant victory during his whole life, though the disproportion between his numbers and those of his idolatrous enemies was very considerably greater than that which exists between the Protestants of Ireland and its idolatrous inhabitants; and when he was dying, he left it as the best legacy to the people; "Be ye very courageous; for no man hath been able to stand before you unto this day. One man of you shall chase a thousand; for the Lord your God, it is he that fighteth for you, as he hath promised you." (Joshua xxiii. 6, 10.)

In the light of such truths as these, I would ask, is not my parable verified? And is the base and infamous, the vile and traitorous cowardice of Peel, and the "fools and blind" that he carries along with him to the provocation of the Almighty, even sufficiently magnified in it? I sincerely and positively say, that if I were admitted into a lazaret-house, an hospital for the unclean victims of loathsome cutaneous disorder, and compelled to remain there, I could not be more overcome with sickening disgust than I am when I read the vile, filthy,

odious, and detestable stuff, the spiritual pus and corruption that defile and disfigure the debates in Parliament. I believe that the respect and consideration with which Popery is viewed, are utterly misplaced, and no less than criminal in the sight of God. Popery is a loathsome, hateful, and odious system; and it renders its victims weak, contemptible, and spiritually disgusting. Protestants may pity them—nay, must do so; but the most charitable feelings with respect to them are not inconsistent with that utter hatred of Popery which I consider it my duty to endeavour to create. Protestants must learn so to hate Popery as not merely to be ready to lay down their lives against it, but to consider it a high privilege to be allowed to do so. It should also be kept in mind that the miscalled Protestants, who court Papists and dally with Popery, are mere infidels—as blind and infatuated as Papists themselves.

However, I must give a few specimens of all this from a late debate on the Maynooth Bill. The drivelling pusillanimity, the blind compromise of principle, the infatuation, the weakness, and the folly of the Protestant speakers; and the unwarranted presumption on all sides of the strength of the idolatrous “millions,” whose numbers are always exaggerated, cannot fail to strike. I am sure that much more remarkable examples could be quoted; these, however, will serve the purpose.

Colonel T. Wood (Middlesex) could find nothing in the Scriptures [!], in the articles of faith [!!], or in the liturgy of the Church of England [!!!], which forbade him from granting an annual sum for the education of his Roman Catholic fellow-subjects. [Blindness!] Considering that the clergy of the Established Church did not administer to the spiritual wants of the great body of its inhabitants, he thought that it was only just that we should contribute to the education of the clergy of the people [whose sole object is to beguile and trample on them]. If this measure should lead to the endowment of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, it should have his support; for he had come to the opinion that the endowment of the Roman Catholic Church in that country was necessary to the restoration of peace and tranquillity. [Cowardice!]

Sir C. Napier intended to support the bill. He begged Sir R. Inglis, and the gentlemen who entertained his opinions, to reflect that it was not wise, by rejecting this bill, to throw a firebrand into Ireland, when we might be—he would not say that we were—on the eve of war with the United States. [Cowardice and folly!]

Mr. Macaulay—When I remember the faith [namely, idolatry and superstition] of Edward III. and Henry VI., of Margaret of Anjou and Margaret of Richmond, of William of Wykeham, of Archbishop Chicheley and Cardinal Wolsey; when I remember what we have taken from the Roman Catholic religion—King's College, New College, Trinity College, and Christ Church [as if the property of an habitual drunkard had changed hands when he became sober], and when I look at the miserable Do-the-boy's Hall we have given them in return, I ask myself if we are not disgraced by the comparison. But I say, thinking it of the greatest importance that Christianity, even in a form which I think tainted with error, [how delicate this blockhead is in speaking of the master-piece of Satan!] should exercise the strongest influence over the minds of the Irish peasantry; and seeing that it would not have any influence in any form but that of Catholicism, I conceive myself at liberty to furnish to the Irish peasantry competent instructors [in apostasy], and to provide for their teachers [in “blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits”] a suffi-

cient education. Here we see an island with a population of seven millions. [Cowardice!] Exeter Hall sets up its bray (cheering and laughter). The Protestant Operatives of Dublin are calling for an impeachment in exceedingly bad English (laughter and cheers). [Observe how this wretched victim of infidelity speaks of the remonstrances of Bible-reading Protestants!]

Mr. Shaw [the representative of the Irish clergy!]
—He did not speak of such bodies [the Protestant operatives] as those whose petition had been presented the other night by the honourable member for Knaresborough (Mr. Ferrand); he believed there were amongst that body many honest and respectable men, but he [the betrayer of the Protestant corporations] disapproved of their language and conduct (hear), and did not profess to represent their sentiments [namely, because their sentiments were uncompromisingly Protestant]. He (Mr. Shaw) would avoid all theological troversy; and he trusted he would not let drop one word in the observations he con-should make, which could justly give offence to the nicest feelings of conscientious Roman Catholics. [Namely, because he is afraid and ashamed to speak the truth—a moral coward in fact! A pretty representative for the Irish clergy to have in parliament!]

The Earl of Lincoln—He reminded the House that, if it now rejected this measure, it could not restore affairs to the same condition in which they were before it was proposed. It had now raised the hopes of the Roman Catholics of Ireland. He implored it not to dash them ruthlessly down to the ground, for if it did, it would incur a heavy and serious responsibility. [That is, from the rage of idolaters.]

Mr. Sergeant Murphy—The people of Ireland did not receive this measure as a boon to the Roman Catholic priests, but as an act of justice. [Because they regard their spiritual deformities as beautiful.] He asked the House whether it was willing to dash the cup of promise from the lips of Ireland; and, if it were, whether it was prepared to meet the consequences of such insanity. He believed that the adoption of this measure would be most conducive to the interests both of England and Ireland, while the rejection of it would create great and lasting animosity, and endanger the peace of the two kingdoms [by provoking the fury of blind idolaters].

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Goulburn)—I believe this, because, although I differ from my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen on points of faith—and no man could differ from them more widely, or in controversy would oppose them more fearlessly—yet I think that they are animated by the same feelings which animate every Christian man [as if it were possible that like feelings could emanate from contradictory principles]; that they will be grateful for a disposition, on the part of this country, to contribute materially to the comfort and better education [in error] of those in whom they feel the deepest interest. I believe that whatever the priests of Maynooth may acquire under the proposed system, will be so much gained to the Protestant cause (hear). It will soften the hostility which they feel to the Protestant faith; it will bring them to the taking a juster view both of religion and of politics; it will be a blessing to themselves, by enlightening the eyes of their understanding [with the midnight darkness of Popish error]; but if the measure be withheld, and any breach of the tranquillity of Ireland ensue from the inflamed passions of the people on their disappointment, I should like to know who would be responsible for the tranquillity of that country? Deal with us as you please; censure us if you will; condemn us, impeach us, as the honourable member for Knaresborough proposed to do; but do not, by the refusal of this measure, create a flame in Ireland which you may never be able to subdue, and excite passions which are now allayed, but which, if again excited, would end in general confusion, if not the ruin of the empire. [Despicable cowardice! Pray, Mr. Goulburn, to what does God Almighty sentence “the fearful?” To hell.]

Lord John Manners—The pupils of Maynooth did honour to that institution. Under their care the country had not deteriorated in morality, the men in sobriety, or the women in chastity. All their religious functions had been fulfilled with a zeal and self-denial which none could surpass, and which the clergy of other reli-

gions would do well to imitate. In conclusion, he recommended the government, if they wished to carry out their present experiment successfully, to admit frankly the existence of a power which, to their knowledge, was exercising authority in every portion of the British dominions. He recommended it to accredit a minister to the Vatican, to admit a nuncio at St. James's, and not to continue to remain in ignorance of a power [Antichrist] which was in existence before England was a kingdom. He supported it, because he believed that it had been brought forward in a spirit of justice towards the Roman Catholics of Ireland, whom this country had so long persecuted and oppressed; and because it might tend, however remotely, to hasten the advent of that happy day when we and they, with mutual confessions of pride and hard-heartedness, and with April tears of joy and contrition, shall kneel before the common altars of our common faith [alike "blaspheming the Almighty."—See Art.] : a consummation which alone can effectually avail to Christianise the expanded and expanding empires of manufactures and commerce; to give to toil its just reward, [by entailing on all the curse of God.] and hallow it with a Christian benediction; bind up the wounds of bleeding distracted Ireland [by securing the damnation of her people]; and render England what she once was, and may be again—[a land of darkness and bondage] the queen of the nations, the glory of Christendom, stretching her roots deep into the richest soil of antiquity, and spreading her fruitful branches into the measureless expanse of an unseen futurity. (Loud cheers.) [Miserable blindness!]

Mr. Smythe entered into an eloquent eulogium on the simple but fervent devotion [to their idols] which he had himself observed among the pupils at Maynooth. He did not know whether any advantage would be gained by converting the pupil of Maynooth into something more of an ecclesiastic than he was at present. The proposition was, to make the Irish priest more of an abbé, and less of a curé; more of a chaplain, and less of a pastor; more of a man of this world, and less of a man of the world to come. This design would fail; or, if it succeeded, he (Mr. Smythe) pitied their short-sightedness. Elevate the priest from his sphere, and at once they would destroy his influence. It was because he was of the commons he led the commons. He knew that on this particular point he was at issue with nearly the whole House; but he would remind them that Napoleon, not the least of whose many miracles was that of giving back [Popish apostasy] Christianity to France—that Napoleon had left it as his solemn opinion, that a priesthood for the people must be of the people. Besides, he had himself seen the Roman Catholic prelacy [devouring wolves, ministers of Antichrist] on a day of great solemnity at Maynooth—plain men, poor men—the same expression might brand them as vulgar men. About them was none of the splendour and gorgeousness for which the Church of Rome had been rebuked [so carefully had they put on the sheep's clothing]—no splendour—no pomp—no representation. He was wrong; there was the representation, not of so many thousands a year, but of so many millions of souls [of which they made profitable merchandise]. (Cheers.) These were the men, and this the priesthood, whom the right honourable baronet at the head of the government had made his friends by his conduct on this occasion. They would remember that, notwithstanding a powerful opposition, he had brought forward this measure of conciliation without restriction or distrust, and received that gratitude which he well deserved to reap. (Hear.) And in that hour of emergency and crisis, which those who look to nations, and not to cabinets, knew well could not be distant, when their *entente cordiale* with France would fail, as it surely would, they would have an *entente cordiale* with Ireland. [Infamous cowardice!] In that day of emergency, when the right honourable baronet would be called on to rally round him the energies of this mighty empire—for he (Sir R. Peel) alone, notwithstanding all this temporary clamour, represented its requirements—in that day of emergency the right honourable baronet would be able to adopt to the enemies of England, be they in Washington or be they in Paris, the solemn and beautiful language of the noble lord the member for London—"Our queen reigns over a united people." [Fudge!] (Cheers.)

Mr. Redington expressed his satisfaction, as a Roman Catholic, with the present

measure. He would offer the right honourable baronet and the people of England a word of advice—in all their legislation for Ireland, whether in church or in state, to remember that they were legislating for seven millions of Catholics." [Spiritually-halt, lame, and blind.]

Mr. Sheil—But if this policy were persisted in—if the people of Ireland despaired of obtaining justice from a British parliament, he was afraid that the whole nation would join in one anathema against the union; and that if England met with adversity, it would have occasion to repent it when repentance was too late [namely, should the cripples use their crutches].

Mr. M. J. O'Connell—The measure was valuable in spite of the smallness of the sum with which the honourable member for Ashton had taunted them to-night—it was valuable to Ireland, because they looked upon it as the first of a series [of infamous compromises on the part of a Protestant government] (cries of "Hear"). Let him not be misunderstood, and, if possible, let him not be misrepresented. He did not speak of the endowment of the priests, [oh, no!] which honourable members were so anxious to combat before it was proposed, though, upon that question, he would appeal to the whole party opposed to him—from the honourable member for Oxford university, to the honourable member for Knaresborough—if the Roman Catholics were to ask for an endowment on the ground that their religion was the religion of the majority, on what just, on what intelligible principle could they refuse it? [Was there no one to say "Because it is false?"] How could the honourable member compare the rich substantial dissenters, composed of the middle classes of England, with the Catholics of Ireland? All the blue books which had been published, revealing the starving miserable condition of the Irish peasant, showed that the comparison was altogether absurd. [How he glories in the beggary of his country!]

I think, if the character of the extracts be considered, especially when it is recollected that they furnish in fact but mild specimens of the moral incapacity of the Legislature, as it is at present constituted, all my readers will confess, that the clearance which I have described in my imaginary debate, is a consummation devoutly to be wished for.

But, how deeply are we indebted to Christianity! How much do we owe to Protestantism! Look at Mark vi. 18—20. There you find a kingling,—a deputy viceroy,—an upstart official. A beautiful woman dances before him; fascinated with her charms he desires her to ask what she will, and swears with an oath that she shall have it. "Well, then," said the beautiful but bloody-minded young woman, "give me in a dish a preacher's head." Forthwith he sends, and his messenger brings back John Baptist's head swimming in his blood, and he lays the offering at the feet of his charmer! Now, look at our queen; the sun never sets upon her vast empire. God save the queen, say I, with all my heart, and God bless her too! I am convinced she would be far from contemplating an act of despotic violence. She would not, if she could—but, thank Heaven, she could not, if she would—not merely cut off the head of the humblest minister in her dominions, but she dares not as much as disturb with an unwarranted interference the hours of his repose!

To what is this owing? To the legitimate operation of the Christian religion—of the Word of God.

There was a strife amongst the disciples of Jesus, as to which of them should be accounted the greatest. "And he said unto them,

The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them ; and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors. But ye shall not be so : he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger ; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve." (Luke xxii. 25, 26.) Profound is the meaning of that text. None could have uttered it but one whose wisdom, with the most unerring glance, penetrated through all time ; and who, being deeply imbued with the spirit of the Christian religion, realized its natural workings and all its inevitable results. The text flies in the face of all the experience that had existed in the world up to the time in which it was spoken. So naturally grovelling is the mind of man among the masses of the unregenerate, so prone to usurpation and tyranny those who are gifted with superior national power, that the tendency ever had been on the part of the subject people almost to adore their rulers, to award them "lordship," with all its attendant adulations, as their proper meed, and to receive whatever doles they might please to dispense as the gracious benefactions of those who were justly entitled to be looked upon as "benefactors;" and, on the part of the rulers, to promote and enforce the sort of feeling which I describe. This state of things must necessarily have continued so long as moral darkness abode upon the earth. Nothing could have done away with it but the bright shining of a moral luminary, which precisely exhibited to all what each was made of; which showed that there was but one proper origin of power; that is, God; that all power being bestowed by him, should be regulated by his revealed will; and that, when governors deviated from that rule, they warranted the remonstrances of every one who respected it, they afforded ground for the anger and discontent of their subjects, and that if they persevered in their rebellion against God, and attempted to make these subjects participators in it, they justified rebellion against themselves. So long as the ruler stands before his people with an open Bible, so long as he can appeal to its inspired pages in justification of his policy, so long may he with a clear conscience enforce obedience, feel convinced that when he cuts down "him that resisteth," he acts but as the minister of God, and that a lightning flash that will scare the rebellious will gleam from the sword of justice which he draws. If, however, he close the sacred volume; if the wisdom in which he walks be irrespective of, or in opposition to it; if he manifestly despise its precepts and trample on its sanctions, he shuts himself out from that appeal to its authority by which he might be justified; he becomes ridiculous in demanding that his subjects should render to him their obedience because they are divinely commanded so to do, when his whole conduct makes it palpable that he despises the Bible as a rule for his own conduct; in effect, putting the sanctions of Christianity out of the question, the sole plea on which human government can be based, is the force of the stronger; and it will be just revered until it is grappled with by a power superior to its own.

Christ, however, knew that he came to illuminate the families of the earth. Before one page of one Gospel was written, his mind contem-

plated the finished canon of the whole Scripture. With a glance into futurity, he saw that Scripture pouring forth streams of knowledge and of truth upon the nations; he foresaw the impediments that would temporarily check its progress, when the third part of the sun, and the third part of the moon, and the third part of the stars, were smitten, so that the third part of them was darkened, and the day shone not for a third part of it, and the night likewise; and the cry of Woe, woe, woe, resounded through the midst of heaven, because of the dark ages. (Revelation viii.) He saw all this, and penetrating further, he beheld the twilight dawn of the Reformation in the rising of his servant Wickliffe, and he watched the progress of the growing light; he beheld the dispersion of the clouds that veiled his own glory. He saw the full-orbed splendour of the church, that moon which shines by his light, and the effulgence of the countless stars which he should cause to rise, enlighten, cheer, and direct mankind. He witnessed the coming of a Bacon, who should teach men that knowledge of the material world could only be obtained by carrying into philosophy the principle of the Reformation; and that as that mighty change led men to derive their acquaintance with moral and religious truth from the Word of God, so should they draw every physical truth from his works. He saw this: he saw the invention of the steam engine, and its application to the printing press; and he beheld from every single object a nature, a combination of lights, all tending to place his own Word within the hand of every child of man, until at length a public opinion should be formed identical with the spirit that animated him and proceeded from him; and he foresaw, as the result, the explosion of every false maxim of government; and at length rulers altered from despots—from being the depositaries of arbitrary power, to be esteemed “as they that do serve;” merely, in fact, as servants of the State.

Yes, thank God! the principle has been working long: it is our high privilege to dwell in a land in which it powerfully operates. The giant oppression is making immense throes to hold mankind still in his grip; he has marshalled all his battalions. Whole troops of Jesuits and Propagandists dream that they shall be able, through the multiplication of lies, by means of that instrumentality which truth has produced, and which is truth's peculiar weapon, to deluge the world, obfuscate the human intellect, create horrors and apprehensions of the light, and lead to the expulsion of the Bible: but onward it marches, conquering and to conquer; revolutionising states, and arousing the world; nor will it cease till the last link of the chain of despotism be broken for ever, and millennial happiness bless mankind.

What pitiable blockheads these Tractarians are! Think of the wretched drivellers glorying in the dark ages; re-publishing the lying legends of priestcraft and absurdity which amused and afflicted mediæval Christendom; and fancying that they will be able, once again, to see England, if not the world, humbly soliciting to kiss the Pope's toe! They boast of the middle ages; they refer to the monas-

teries as the depositaries of all the learning that has survived to these days; they tell us that the monks were those who acted the part of the guardians of literature, who kept alive and transmitted Christian knowledge! Why, if the intellect of these heretics were not as dull as their hearts are obdurate and their affections corrupt, would they not perceive that the very phraseology that they employ, convicts Popery of the very guilt from which they would exonerate her? "The monks kept alive Christian feeling," "acted as the guardians of all kinds of literature," and, "in the recesses of their cloisters, cultivated those sciences which the military spirit of their times regarded with contempt." Well, and why did Christian feeling require to be kept alive in corners? Just because Popery had banished it from the world. Why did literature require cloistered guardians? Because Popery had spread abroad a prevalent barbarity. Why was it left to monks to cultivate arts and sciences? Because Popery had reduced the population to the condition of brute beasts. Were it not for Popery, which drove the Word of God from society, the steam engine in all probability would have been invented shortly after the conversion of Constantine. A primitive philosopher, who would have made the works of God his guide, and led inquirers in this safe path, would have followed Constantine after as short an interval as Bacon followed the eighth Henry; and the blaze of such enlightenment as now shines upon the world, would have shone in splendour about A. D. 600, above 1200 years ago; and had that been the case, what would be the condition of the world now? And then—"the monks and Popery were the nursing parents of the elegant arts: their Raphaels, their Guidos, their Reubenses, and their Michael Angelos, but for Popery, would neither have met encouragement for their genius, nor subjects to employ it on;" the real truth of the matter being, that directly the contrary is the case. God gave them their talents; Popery prostituted them to the service of her idolatries, and rewarded them—with what? Why, perhaps, with a side-table at a monarch's board, or with the patronage of the great; for which they were obliged to cringe like sycophants. While their reputation scarcely exceeded the circle of those who could actually witness their achievements, Protestantism has made great geniuses, almost kings themselves. Through the instrumentality of the press, and the improvements that have been effected in every department of practical art, it wafts their glory (which is that of him who formed them) into every clime, and conveys into the dwellings of every cottier means whereby he may appreciate their gifts. There is not a village in the land in which a Tractarian makes his appearance, that should not convoke its inhabitants, and prepare an elaborate cap and bells, as a meet award for the benighted creature, who, in these days of scriptural privilege, can dream of the re-introduction of the infatuations of Popery!

We owe all our constitutional privileges to Protestantism; and the sole instrumentality by which they can be maintained, is a just and

well-worked public opinion. Herod cut off the head of John the Baptist. The king of England could not lift the latch of his humblest subject, in order to visit him with detriment or inconvenience. The slightest consideration will show that this is the result of Protestantism long established and fully understood. During Popish times murder was almost systematised in England. In most of Shakspeare's historical plays, (and they are truthful copies of the real history,) one or two professional murderers are a necessary part of the machinery. The murder of the young princes in the Tower, with numberless other similar atrocities; and the wholesale wife-slaughter of Henry VIII. show what Popery was, not merely in its meridian, but even when it began to totter to its fall: and yet these things scarcely produced a public sensation. Dukes and earls had their heads lopped off by scores, while the facts scarcely travelled beyond the precincts of the Tower. At this present moment all England is in a ferment; and what about? Whole columns of the *Times* are devoted to the subject. Well, and what is it which employs the great journal, and arouses the public indignation? Why, the fact that the master of some country workhouse has not thickened sufficiently the gruel of the paupers committed to his care. Yes, this is almost literally the fact: all England is in a ferment because the paupers of Andover have been badly treated. Alas! here in Dublin, worthy men may be run down by the score, and that because of their worth and any effort made to obtain redress from them will prove almost inevitably a failure.

I trust it may not be thought by any one that I enlarge on this topic in a presumptuous or censorious spirit. I feel the deepest concern at being obliged to mention it; I feel grieved that truth should compel me to say, that the want of public spirit which I have alluded to is an opprobrium to the city. It is to remedy the evil that I speak of it as I do. What a noble Protestant population is there in Dublin and its vicinity! I should suppose that the Protestants who could conveniently assemble at a Protestant meeting in this city, cannot be less in number than one hundred thousand; and these, in the main, persons of some education and respectability. How irresistible would demonstrations of sound opinion prove, if sent forth backed by the weight that they would derive from such vast multitudes of thoughtful, intelligent men. And yet, what is the designation by which the Irish metropolis is sometimes described in the London journals? It is with a wounded spirit that I have read it again and again. It is called "the city of jackeens!"—i. e. of little jacks—of nobodies—of mere nonentities—of persons, indeed, well dressed and fashionable in their exterior, but whose time is spent in lounging and idleness—who do not seem to feel that they have a country, in the furtherance of whose welfare it is their bounden duty to occupy themselves. So far from fulfilling this duty, they seem to have renounced the rights of citizenship altogether; and this at a time that there is not one Protestant operative in the city of Dublin who does not feel that he has rights, and that these rights entitle him to have an influential though humble voice

in the decision of every public act that has a bearing on his or the public welfare. I now proclaim in the ears of every Protestant in Dublin, that he has a right to be heard—a right to judge of the conduct of those who are placed in authority over him—a right to test that conduct by the standard of Scripture—to reward them with his approbation, if there be an accordance between that conduct and the standard of rectitude, and to visit them with condemnation if these differ from each other. No matter how lowly his position is, how destitute of the gifts of fortune (as it is called) he may be; if he be a consistent Protestant, he is likely to be able to come to sound conclusions, and the Disposer of hearts is able to give abundant efficacy to his testimony. He cannot complain of the want of an instrumentality that would enable him to give effect to good wishes. The Protestant Association has been called into existence for the express purpose of giving unity, concentration, and voice to the sentiments of Protestants at large. I would, as far as it may be proper, entreat of my Protestant countrymen, of all degrees, to fling off the apathy that is so opprobrious to them; and I would suggest to all Protestant Irish women, that they have much in their power in this matter. They should refuse their affections to young men who can look with disregard upon the wrongs which afflict their brethren in the faith, or upon the woes which Popery entails on Ireland. It is melancholy to see shoals of Protestant youths doing no more than crowding to the concert, or fluttering in the ball room, or cantering along the park, or habitually lounging in the streets, although furnished with education that might supply them with stores of political wisdom,—a wisdom which the glorious privileges of their country, purchased by the blood of martyrs, entitle them to make the most profitable use of. I have sons; and rather than see them grow up in criminal neglect of such gifts, though I love them as my own soul, I would prefer seeing them carried to their graves before my eyes.

The circumstances of our country, which I detailed in a previous chapter of this work, afford, to a certain extent, indeed perhaps I might say altogether, an explanation of the painful phenomena to which I am now directing public attention. Almost from the time that Ireland had, popularly speaking, a Protestant history, until, I may say, the fatal year of '29, Protestants were in the ascendant. They were, during all this time, rather the governors of the country than mere subjects in it. Their institutions were nourished and supported by the State; and it had a place at its disposal for every one of them who wanted it; hence they grew into the habit of being almost identified with the existing government; they seemed to think that they had little else to do than to approve of all its acts. To stand in opposition to the government during that period, seemed to indicate a radical, if not a rebellious spirit. Those that have grown into full age under such a state of things, appear to have maintained their former feelings, now that every national institution has been altered to the detriment of Protestants. I have known gentlemen of rank and property—I might

say, almost at the present day—to declare in my own hearing, that they considered no man warranted to stand forth in a position of antagonism to “the powers that be.” I have known a gentleman who has a high position in the Protestant body, and who is vehement in his opposition to Repeal, and to everything which verges towards that direction, to give it as his opinion, that Sir Robert Peel was quite justified in dismissing Mr. Watson! and that upon the express ground that no man has a right to oppose the government!

The altered state of things, however, requires a speedy abandonment of all such weak nonsense, and shows that it is now our duty to unlearn much of that which, though formerly, perhaps, not improper—certainly not injurious—is now unsuitable and unwholesome.

And here, I think, the occasion requires that I should remark upon the extraordinary contrast which the present conduct of Roman Catholics presents to that, which, on the part of Protestants, I have animadverted upon. The Roman Catholics seem actuated by a genuine public spirit. They are the extravagant eulogisers of constitutional liberty. The whole body seems to kindle into indignation at anything resembling an unjust severity with which any individual of their number may be visited. Their press roars, O’Connell bellows, and the Repeal Association fulminates, should the authorities, or any one of them, in any part of Ireland, or, indeed, elsewhere, trespass, at the expense of a Roman Catholic, upon any of the prerogatives, or imaginary prerogatives of the people. Should a nobleman refuse to a Popish priest or curate the locale for a mass house, loud are the denunciations of the Poppedom in Ireland. Should a jury of the most truth-dealing Protestants try a case in which a Papist is involved, all Ireland resounds with the grievance. Mr. O’Connell, accompanied by the mayor of Cork, and a large aquatic convoy, sailed from Cork to Cove the other day, and proceeded to land upon the estate of a gentleman which skirted the water. Not thinking it proper that he should be seen to countenance a Repeal glorification, the gentleman forbade the trespass. The universal press of the Repealers joined in denouncing the illiberality as intolerable. In a word, while we have to deplore the want of public spirit on the part of Protestants, the Roman Catholic body seems entirely free from such a reproach. “Those freemen whom the truth makes free” appear tied by the trammels of narrowing apprehensions, while the bondslaves of Popish priests stand before the world as the champions of liberty. It is obvious that such a state of mind cannot arise from the principles which they profess. Whence, then, does it originate? It springs, in reality, from Protestantism. O’Connell derives his religious principles from the breviary and the confessional; he has derived his political practice from the British constitution; he has not studied in vain British law, nor contemplated without profit to his party the extent of British liberty. Why did the British constitution confer liberty upon the people? Just because Protestant principle had prepared them to use it aright—because that principle,

derived as it is from the Word of God, and engrafted into the soul of all true Protestants by the operation of the Holy Spirit, disposes each man spontaneously to walk in the paths of virtue, truth, and wisdom; makes them obedient, not merely for wrath, but also for conscience' sake, and causes them in the main to be regulated by the spirit of their laws. If Protestants were men who could, as a body, for a moment entertain the idea that they might "drive a coach and six through an act of parliament," they neither would nor should possess a free constitution. The very qualification which fits them for it, is the state of mind which renders them incapable of abusing it. O'Connell desired liberty of course; he desired the overthrow of the church; he desired to dip his hand into the public purse, in order that he might have the priestly tyrants of the people instructed at the public expense; he desired all this, not from a love of liberty, but from a spirit of domination and an ambition to break down that which he was taught to believe a heresy.

John Milton, in his second defence of the people of England, (*Prose Works*, p. 948, 4to. London, 1835,) enlarges upon the idea that Protestants would lose their liberties, and deserve to lose them, if they became indifferent to their principles; and he puts the thought into language so strongly bearing upon the view which I am urging, that I cannot forbear to give the passage.

For who would vindicate your right of unrestrained suffrage, or of choosing what representatives you liked best, merely that you might elect the creatures of your own faction, whoever they might be, or him, however small might be his worth, who would give you the most lavish feasts and enable you to drink to the greatest excess? Thus, not wisdom and authority, but turbulence and gluttony, would soon exalt the vilest miscreants from our taverns and our brothels, from our towns and villages, to the rank and dignity of senators. For should the management of the republic be entrusted to persons to whom no one would willingly entrust the management of his private concerns; and the treasury of the State be left to the care of those who had lavished their own fortunes in an infamous prodigality? Should they have the charge of the public purse, which they would soon convert into a private, by their unprincipled pecculations? Are they fit to be the legislators of a whole people, who themselves know not what law, what reason, what right and wrong, what crooked and straight, what licit and illicit mean? who think that all power consists in outrage, all dignity in the parade of insolence? who neglect every other consideration for the corrupt gratification of their friendships, or the prosecution of their resentments? who disperse their own relations and creatures through the provinces for the sake of levying taxes and confiscating goods—men, for the greater part, the most profligate and vile, who buy up for themselves what they pretend to expose to sale, who thence collect an exorbitant mass of wealth, which they fraudulently divert from the public service; who thus spread their pillage through the country, and in a moment emerge from penury and rags, to a state of splendour and of wealth? Who could endure such thievish servants, such vicegerents of their lords! Who could believe that the masters and the patrons of a banditti could be the proper guardians of liberty? or who would suppose that he should ever be made one hair more free by such a set of public functionaries, (though they might amount to five hundred elected in this manner from the counties and boroughs,) when among them who are the very guardians of liberty, and to whose custody it is committed, there must be so many who know not either how to use or to enjoy liberty, who neither understand the principles nor merit the possession? But what is worthy of remark,

those who are the most unworthy of liberty are wont to behave most ungratefully towards their deliverers. Among such persons, who would be willing either to fight for liberty or to encounter the least peril in its defence? It is not agreeable to the nature of things that such persons ever should be free. However much they may brawl about liberty, they are slaves, both at home and abroad, but without perceiving it; and when they do perceive it, like unruly horses that are impatient of the bit, they will endeavour to throw off the yoke, not from the love of genuine liberty, (which a good man only loves and knows how to obtain,) but from the impulses of pride and little passions.

I trust that all Protestants may lay these sentiments to heart: they will be sure to lose their liberties when they cease to be governed by their principles; and Papists, who have no such principles, never were fitted for such liberties.

However, when Protestants became faithless and ungodly; when vanity, folly, and worldly-mindedness occupied in their breasts the place which should have been pre-eminently devoted to spiritual affections; when, in the progress of their latitudinarianism, they conferred a position in the constitution upon the enemies of the Word of God, and the opponents of the faith of the Gospel—upon those who had burned their fathers by the faggot and slaughtered them with the sword, God raised up an instrument to scourge them—a man gifted with sufficient cunning to perceive that British liberty might be abused to its own subversion; that, by taking advantage of the laws, the laws themselves might be trampled on, and thus the glorious structure of our Protestant constitution prostrated into the dust. It was a series of substantive infractions of British law by Papists—violations of its spirit, while the letter was, perhaps, not departed from—which led some to entertain the idea that the measure of Popish emancipation was an inevitable necessity. These infractions, instead of producing that result, would, had not our governors been infatuated, have certainly led them to adopt steps to recover the ground that had been lost. It was the possession of the elective franchise which enabled Roman Catholics to send into Parliament besotted Protestants to advocate their claims, and which thus gave to themselves a vicarious position in the Legislature. It was the permission to Papists to take up the practice of British law with the spirit of which they were unacquainted, and to the operation of which they must be hostile, that furnished them with leaders who were practised legally to quibble us into slavery. A well-ordered Protestant mind never could have set at nought such laws as were constructed to put down the Popish association. Such a mind never could have thought of the gross contempt of the spirit of statute law which the celebrated Clare election involved. And what is the whole career of the Papists at the present moment, but a prolonged demonstration that they are disqualified for freedom? The result, however, is, that they are in point of fact carrying on a war against our national institutions; and that, animated by a military spirit against the government, they rise in a feeling of inbred hostility against every act that implies its ascendancy. That is the feeling

which rallies them round the so-called victim, and causes them to feel the enthusiasm which a victory inspires, when they can succeed in giving the government a slap in the face. It is not public spirit which actuates them, it is sectarian animosity—a truth which is abundantly evidenced by the whole tenor of their conduct: they are kindled into fury, indeed, should the government, or any of its functionaries, seem to offer an injury to a Papist, or to be indifferent to the claims of the Popish system to be ascendant in the State. And this resembles the operation of public spirit; but a little observation will show that it is nothing of the sort. It is just as powerfully evoked against the Papist who would presume to think for himself, or who would seem to bear, with impatience, the trammels of a tyrannical priesthood, as it is against the government or the functionaries of the British crown. Witness the persecutions that are carried on against Roman Catholic converts in every part of Ireland. I admit that perhaps a slight objection may be taken up against this illustration, still it, to a certain extent, throws a light upon the truth which I have laid down—that it is a bigoted and sectarian, and not a liberal and public spirit, which governs Roman Catholics. They absolutely interdict the exercise of freedom of opinion. A war is at this present moment being waged against the *Evening Post*, because the editor of that journal presumed to state that the glorification of "the Holy Coat of Treves" was "gross superstition." He was beneath the mark; had he called it "gross idolatry," he would have been quite justifiable. The *Nation* newspaper seems to have caught a little of the spirit of freedom; and the result is, that it almost exists beneath the ban of the Popish leaders and the press of "the faithful."

CHAPTER VI.

INTERFERENCE IN POLITICS A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT—WISDOM OF THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON—HIS FOLLY.

I certainly think that Cromwell should have a statue in the new Houses of Parliament. This question is now extensively mooted, and in my humble judgment it ought to be answered in the affirmative. I know that he was a rebel—and I hate rebellion; a usurper—and usurpation is detestable; a hypocrite—and hypocrisy is base; a regicide—and as such he was abominable. Notwithstanding all this, he was, in his day, the monarch of England; and with all his faults he played, in some respects, a noble part; and his history affords a right royal lesson—a lesson that it would be a pity kings should be allowed to forget. If he took part in giving sentence against the king, he did so but as part of a council; and it is astonishing how much participation with others in an act blunts the sense of feeling which the responsibility of that act may involve. I dare venture to say, that

had Cromwell been obliged to act as an individual, Charles would have worn his head in his sepulchre, and lived till nature had called him to his account. I am by no means disposed to defend the conduct of Cromwell; but having been *de facto* the acknowledged monarch of England, I cannot think that he should, on account of characteristic crimes, be shut out from the recognition that posterity should award him. Say that he was a rebel, a murderer, a usurper, and a hypocrite. Richard the Third was more criminal than he in every one of these respects; his offences, if possible, more marked with detestable traits, and not so much palliated by concurrent circumstances. The only way whereby a successor to Cromwell can be prevented is, by the avoidance, on the part of British sovereigns, of unscriptural policy. If they entail upon themselves the anger of the God of the Bible, who says of himself, "By me kings reign;" and who has abundantly proved by the history of his own people, that the foundation of a throne, though it be set upon a rock, crumbles to ashes when his word is set at nought, the instrument will be raised up to punish them, and to break their throne to atoms.

By all means, let Cromwell have a statue. And, in order that our Queen and her posterity may escape the dangers which the machinations of a Cromwell might originate, let every loyal subject perform his part—let him show himself a public-spirited citizen—let him stand forth as a faithful witness against the folly, the treachery, or the infidelity of statesmen; and put away from him those disloyal maxims which, proclaiming that "religion has nothing to do with politics," would deprive the monarch of the service that should be rendered to her by the wisdom and the piety of her people. Christian men should be not merely passive in this matter; they should not merely each say, "If a meeting be called on an important subject I will attend;" but they should consider it their business to do so; just as much their business as producing their manufactures if they be artisans, selling their goods if they be tradesmen, or attending to their clients if their occupations be professional; they should not stop to reflect—"The fulfilment of this duty may deprive me of my customers, and it may be imprudent that I should engage in it;" but come what will—be the consequences what they may, they should regard themselves as bound to perform that public function which the interests of their country, of their posterity, and, indeed, of mankind in general, require at their hands: it is the general shrinking from such responsibilities which tends to render its performance detrimental in individual cases. The prevalence of the wretched maxims which I have animadverted on, rendering indifference the rule, makes the faithful man a prey. It would be impossible to visit with injurious consequences a whole community that was faithful. Indeed, God himself would hold the shield of his almighty protection over the people who would view themselves as his witnesses, and manifest a determination—come weal, come woe—to speak forth those truths of which he had made them, in their sphere, the depositaries, the guardians, and the maintainers.

The spirit of the Popish system is the spirit of bondage ; and he who does not live beneath its influence, clearly indicates that he is not a thorough-bred Papist. I met in travelling, a short time since, a Conservative Roman Catholic ; he and I, and two Scotch gentlemen, rode together in the same vehicle from Portadown to Newry. One of the Scotchmen was a Secessionist, opposed to the existence of all religious establishments ; and the other was a member of the Scotch church. I carried on a friendly controversy with the former, in which, as it was felt by all present, I successfully vindicated the principle of a Protestant established church and Protestant ascendancy. The Roman Catholic, who took a part in the conversation, inconsistently attacked the principle of an establishment, and yet made it quite evident that he rejoiced in the endowment of Maynooth College, and that he would willingly see his own church quartered on the public ; at the same time he railed against Repeal, and gave it as his serious opinion, that O'Connell in contending for the Repeal of the Union had no other object in view than the sordid one of keeping up a rich "tribute" for the benefit of himself and his family. I maintained, on the other hand, that I believed O'Connell to be an honest rogue — a man who was on principle unprincipled ; and I think this is the true view of the case.

In reality, *what O'Connell aims at, and what his policy manifestly tends to, is the overthrow of the Protestant church and the establishment of his own* : that he appreciates the very obvious effect of this policy, he has on several occasions clearly made manifest ; as, for example, in the celebrated and really humorous burst of feeling which he gave utterance to among the Repealers when he heard the development of Peel's Maynooth scheme : "Agitation, I thank you ; Conciliation Hall, I am obliged to you ; Repeal, Maynooth ought to pray for you." The man who thus spoke knows well what he is about ; he has projected a great plan, and he is carrying it out successfully. He works the important project a thousand times more successfully through the Repeal agitation than he could if he honestly avowed his true purpose. In the first place, he perceives that the public characters of England — and, I regret to say, too many of the Protestants of Ireland also — seem to regard Repeal as a much greater evil than the endowment of the Popish priesthood ; and that every step by which he furthers the Repeal cause drives them nearer to the alternative of the establishment of Popery. Without saying one word in favour of this latter object, he perceives, and indeed all the world perceives, that he is forcing the former upon the attention of statesmen ; so that the progress of his work inevitably brings him nearer to the downfall of the church ; while, secondly, if he openly avowed the latter intention, he would at once disassociate from him, perhaps, the Henry Grattans, the Smith O'Briens, and even the Tom Steeles. His proceedings would immediately wear a sectarian colour ; they would cease to be denominated "national ;" they would bear the imputation of being the mere operations of a Popish faction ; and they would admit the possibility of

awkward charges of perjury, of disregard of oaths, of violations of engagements, and of the breach of that faith on the supposed validity of which the measure of '29 was conceded.

I do not blame O'Connell for all this. It is highly unprincipled; but then his church warrants such want of principle; it is abominably dishonest; but it is such dishonesty as his church not only sanctions, but sanctifies. At the same time, such is the exceeding deceitfulness of the human heart, that the man may really think himself quite sincere in looking for "the Repeal;" and while he hugs himself upon the immediate benefits which accrue both to his pocket and to his sect, and sees with sufficient sagacity the establishment of his church in the foreground, he may easily interpret such results as the mere accidents of his movement; and flatter himself that it is nationality and patriotism which impel him forward: a conclusion the more natural and easy when he sees it so easily swallowed by Smith O'Brien and the other "Protestant" dupes whom he sweeps along with his tail.

I contend for it, then, that since it is the duty of a good Papist to seek for the ascendancy of his church, and since his principles quite warrant the Jesuitry of Mr. O'Connell, it is the duty of every Papist to join him; and consequently, so far from admiring "Conservative Roman Catholics," in the glorification of whom the *Mail* is so elaborate, and whom it declares more worthy of the support of a Protestant government than even Protestants themselves—so far from this, I regard all such Roman Catholics with a certain amount of distaste, as I am sure every genuine Protestant also does. I like to see every man consistent with his principle. If he be a Papist, let him act the Papist. If he feel that he ought not to do this, let him turn Protestant at once, and act as such. But away with the loathsome falsehood, that our glorious cause stands in need of any assistance that "Conservative Papists" can render to it; or courts the forbearance that may be derived from their inconsistency with their principles or their unjustifiable hostility to the man to whom they owe everything, and whose policy at the present moment is unquestionably the best calculated to promote the establishment of their church and its ultimate ascendancy. But we will change the subject.

"F. M. the Duke of Wellington never interferes with matters over which he has no control." Here is a dogma of the great captain of the age that has become almost stereotyped upon the general mind. Let his grace be entreated to interfere in a case of oppression; to throw the shield of his character and influence over the head of the injured; to protect the church, or to raise his voice against the adoption by the State of a system of education at variance with true religion; forthwith the suppliant is peremptorily, though courteously informed, that "the Duke of Wellington does not interfere where he has no control."

Now, I venture to say that this reply of his grace indicates a state

of mind that is utterly antagonistic to the spirit of the British constitution. It is, indeed, highly characteristic of the individual; it indicates the mind of the soldier; but it is quite at variance with the feeling which becomes a citizen, and should distinctly mark the British statesman.

In the army every man has his fixed place; each regiment is a machine, of which the officers and men are the cranks, wheels, screws, bolts, rollers, &c. Each individual in it has merely to play a part so strictly defined, that it involves a consideration of his port and bearing, the direction of his eyes, the position of every limb of his body. The corporal has no right to "interfere" with the sergeant's matters, nor he with those of the ensign; nor, in a word, any individual with another man's affairs "over which he has no control." This is all admirable in the army; but the army is an institution governed and regulated by the most despotic principles. The more complete the spirit of submission which the subordinates display, the more perfect the working of this great slaughtering machine will be; and the mind which is thoroughly imbued with the military spirit, and takes its idea of proprieties from the camp, is indeed admirable in its way; but so far forth shows a certain amount of disqualification for the fulfilment of the functions of a civilian.

I entertain the highest possible admiration for the unparalleled professional attributes of the Duke of Wellington, and for the extraordinary talents that distinguish him. His despatches must immortalize him. His style is a model of perspicacity; in lucid expression of sentiment he cannot have a superior; and the soundness of judgment which, through the whole of that wondrous compilation, he is manifested as applying to every question, however complicated, that is brought before him, cannot fail to create in every one who is qualified to appreciate character, a profound sense of the possession on his grace's part of matchless ability.

His grace was not a mere soldier; he was a military philosopher. I apprehend that the secret of his victories is to be traced to a deeper source than that which the cleverest tactician could command.

It is impossible to read the narrative of the great military struggle in which the duke played so conspicuous a part, without coming to the conclusion that he and his imperial rival did not merely contend in arms, but that there was brought, in their case, into collision, mental qualities of the very highest order. Napoleon wielded not so much French swords as French spirits. Wellington opposed him, not with the British bayonet, but with British souls.

You see in the case of the former, the workings of a conviction that he ruled over battalions of enthusiasts. You perceive all the energies of his mind employed to evoke that enthusiasm, to create in the breasts of his troops a thirst for that glory which he knew them to be chiefly quickened by; he seems to have been aware that it was by the impetus of an assault—by the fury which grew out of a rapid onset, in which reason scarcely had a part to play, that they would alone achieve

success. Here lay his *forte*, and he knew it ; and so long as he contended with mere soldiers, the flight of his eagles through almost the length and breadth of Europe and Africa, was over fields strewed with the corpses of his victims. At last, he became matched with a master spirit. Wellington penetrated into the heart of his antagonist, and there he discovered the mystery of his might. He coolly placed into the metaphysical balance the mind of Britons and the mind of Frenchmen ; he saw that he was the leader of a phlegmatic race, who, in a mere battle of enthusiasm, would be worsted—a thinking, reasoning, grave, and sober people, not likely to be kindled with such flames as the genius of his opponent could so easily excite ; but, at the same time, patient and enduring, and fraught with a dauntless energy of purpose—an energy which, if it would not so brilliantly triumph, appeared incapable of understanding what it meant to yield. He weighed these counter qualities ; he compared their relative worth, and by a course of reasoning, brief, perhaps, but which a meaner mind could not have accomplished save through the most elaborate process, he arrived at the conclusion, that by making proper use of the material with which he was furnished, he might not merely fling his gigantic adversary as a prey into the midst of the rocks of the ocean, but demonstrate to the remotest ages of posterity that the native qualities of the British character were, in the battle field, more than a match for the most chivalrous powers that ever elicited the astonishment of mankind.

Mark, on the plains of Waterloo, these consummate generals ! As the great duke contemplated the lightning charges of the cuirasseers, and of the imperial guard, he quietly bode his time ; battalion after battalion thundered upon his van ; his troops fell by thousands, each man wounded in the front and in his place ; and the survivors scarcely supposed but that it was a shrinking from danger, a want of confidence in their courage, which rendered their general inactive ; but he, the while, was pondering upon the waste of energy that he beheld expended upon his unyielding hosts ; he was calculating, with all the coolness of a practical physician, the moment when the rapidity of their movements would exhaust the wind of his assailants—the moment when their steeds would be breathless and their fiery ranks worn out. The emperor raged and stamped : “ Those vile English,” said he, “ know not when they are beaten ; my troops are fainting with efforts such as mortal eye never before witnessed. Why does not the enemy fly the field ? ” Little did he know his man ! When Napoleon calculated that the victory should be won, Wellington knew that his moment had arrived, and with the cry of “ Up, guards, and at them ! ” he prostrated into the dust for ever the throne and the dynasty of Napoleon I. It is quite impossible that any man can appreciate more highly than I do, the great military qualities of the glorious Arthur, Duke of Wellington.

But, after all, what is he ? Why, he is a great general, and no more. And what is a great general ? A mere upper servant. He wears

shoulder-knots, and cocks' feathers in his hat, and has a coat trimmed with gold lace; and he is, in fact, I repeat, properly speaking, just an upper servant of the British Cabinet; he is a chief man-butcher of the State. The constitution neither does admit, nor should admit, the commander-in-chief of the army to a seat in the Cabinet. He is quite out of his place there. The violation of this constitutional rule, in the case of the admirable Duke, is a fearful deviation from constitutional rectitude.

The British Cabinet should be composed of grave men of peace, each a diligent student of the Word of God; they should jointly and severally try, by that unerring standard, every great political and international question which comes before them. They should be slow, very slow, to issue the command, "Draw swords!" while at the same time they should not be forgetful of the last clause of the thirty-seventh article of the church, to wit: "It is lawful for Christian men, at the command of the magistrates, to wear weapons and serve in the wars." Christ would never have said, "Let him that hath no sword, sell his garment and buy one," (Luke xxii. 36,) had he designed to inculcate the principle, that there could not arise any occasion in which war would be proper. The poet, James Montgomery, justifies the principle of war in a manner so beautiful and touching, and at the same time so suggestive of the most unanswerable reasoning, that the slightest glance at his exquisite lines must convince every intelligent mind.

"The battalions of men with their banners unfurl'd,
An infant to shield from the swords of the world."

The British Cabinet, I repeat, in the quietude of their council chamber, and from a consideration of the Word of God, should decide when war should be carried on. Providence has placed at their disposal a force which, in a just cause, must be invincible. When they have come to a decision that scriptural principle requires the drawing of the sword, their business then is, to send their messenger to the commander-in-chief, desiring him to embark—say for France, march upon Paris and take it. He has nothing to do with the reasons why or wherefore, *pro* or *con*; he is merely to understand that the power which pays him demands that particular exercise of his services; and that it expects, not merely obedience, but success. The immemorial practice of the British Cabinet has been, to hang the conquered general. No matter what mishap may have led to his defeat, he is regarded as the criminal cause of it; he may manœuvre, he may retreat, should the occasion demand it, but he must succeed, or with his head be responsible for misconduct.

A mind influenced as that of the commander-in-chief of the British forces, save under the most extraordinary circumstances, is likely to be, must constitute a most improper element in a deliberative body, such as the British Cabinet is. The deliberations of such a body

should be severely regulated by sound principle : justice, truth, and righteousness, all deduced from the Word of God, ought to be the inflexible standard around which the thoughts of Cabinet councillors should circulate, and by which their decisions should be inexorably swayed. An individual should not be admitted into their number who would be likely to say with any authority, "We cannot do this, though it be right; or we cannot avoid that, though it be wrong;" or, on the other hand, "Let us proceed in this direction, because we have the power to do so, though justice would forbid;" or, "Let us crush this power, since we can do so, even though religion interdict that we should profit by the aggrandisement;" in a word, a mind governed by the vulgar calculations of brute force, and whose policy would almost necessarily be, to a great degree, regulated by considerations of this sort—all such considerations being, in fact, low, grovelling, and sordid, when compared with those founded upon the loftier principles of truth and righteousness, such a mind should be utterly excluded from the councils appointed to decide upon the destinies of Britain.

David, the most pious monarch whom history has furnished us with a record of, was compelled to employ ungodly generals; and he never ceased to deprecate the policy by which they were governed. Their unrighteous counsels, whenever they prevailed, afflicted him; and yet, remarkable for energy as his character was, he could scarcely maintain against them that ascendancy in the conduct of his government which he felt to be essential to the general welfare. Again and again we find that the complaint burst from him as he thought upon the excesses of his generals, Joab and his brethren: "These sons of Jeruiah are too strong for me." And if king David, sustained as he was by the immense support of immovable and unerring principle, could scarce withstand the suggestions of his military chiefs, how much more likely are such suggestions to have an irresistible force, when urged upon British ministers of the present day! These ministers now, unfortunately, have no principle to govern them. Having once yielded to expediency they have become its slaves. They no longer as much as dare say that it is the pole-star of truth which regulates their course; they are at sea without a compass; it is scarcely possible to conceive that an individual like Wellington should participate in their consultations without being paramount as an adviser and a guide. Hence, instead of principle being the rudder, and wisdom the pilot which holds it, physical force moved by the hand of a soldier, governs the vessel of the State, and decides the track in which it shall run. It is little wonder, under such circumstances, that breakers should be a-head, and that apprehensions of fatality should possess the mind of all the thinking subjects of the crown.

An old proverb says, *Vis consili expers mole ruit sua*; that is to say, "Brute force, if not governed by policy, must perish by its own energy;" otherwise, in order to be of any use, physical force must be under the absolute guidance of wisdom, and consequently of Divine

Wisdom, for there is no wisdom but of God. Now, if bare force must perish—force without counsel, without wisdom, without the direction of the Word of God, it will not be questioned that the national councils, when swayed by a mind that is the representative of the physical force of the kingdom, the depository of its immense power—a mind, all whose movements grow out of the mere consideration of the importance and comparative weight of counteracting forces—will be as likely to destroy themselves as brute force, when altogether ungoverned, would be.

I remember having seen in the papers some time ago, amongst the reports of the debates in the House of Lords, a passage illustrative of the justice of the above observation. I cannot charge my memory with either the time in which the thing occurred, or the exact circumstances connected with it. I am perfectly certain, however, as to the substantial accuracy of the statement which I make. The Bishop of London was led to deplore the encouragement given by the government to idolatry in the eastern possessions of the British crown. The Duke of Wellington, in the peremptory tone for which he is remarkable, and which constantly conveys the idea that he is thoroughly convinced, beyond any manner of question or sort of doubt, that he is absolutely an infallible authority; and that as such he is entitled at once, not merely to demolish those opposed to him, but to command the unhesitating approval of the whole world to every jot and tittle which, as an oracle, he may deliver—I say the Duke of Wellington uprose, or rather upstarted, and spoke to the following effect: “The right reverend prelate has spoken with a great amount of confidence on the subject of government countenancing idolatry in the east, positively asserting that such a course is very wrong; but I beg to inform the right reverend prelate that I know a little of India, and that the men whom he calls idolaters constitute as brave troops as ever fought in the British army, and that I would not be the man to become responsible for the consequences of acting in anything like the manner suggested by the right reverend prelate.”

The Bishop of London in reply, right nobly said, that if the whole of our possessions in India depended upon the sanction of one single act of idolatry, he would be disposed to say, “Away with them altogether!” Right nobly, ay, and right wisely too! He must be a poor student of his Bible, and utterly unacquainted with the truth of the case, who is not convinced that it was to root up idolatry that Providence gave England supremacy in the east; and that every act of hers that would countenance the abomination, would be in contravention of her right of possession. But how admirably does the anecdote illustrate my position! how clearly does it mark the character of the “wisdom” which the duke carries into his political conduct! and how certainly does it indicate the ruin which is likely to be involved in the predominance of such a counsellor in the public affairs of Christian Britain; if, indeed, it can now be called Christian Britain! The truth is, the duke has very nearly unchristianised the British State,

and rendered the Word of God of as small importance as a rule of British policy as it was in his own camp, when his sole object was to circumvent the enemy, and, having taken him as much as possible at disadvantage, to rout and destroy him.

The commander of the forces in a British war is, in fact, merely a subordinate functionary to execute the work imposed upon him by the orders of the Cabinet; and as such only he should be viewed and allowed to act. When his business is assigned to him, he may determine the number of troops necessary for the occasion; it is he who is to determine on the movements these troops shall make, with their numbers and appointments he is alone concerned. But there is a function with respect to those troops that the Cabinet should fulfil, and very accurately fulfil too, with which their commander has, perhaps, but little to do; and that is, to consider whether there be anything in the principles of those who compose their battalions antagonistic to success. They are taught by the Word of God that "God is the Lord of hosts." They are there abundantly informed, that it is he who giveth victory unto kings; and that if numbers be calculated on, irrespectively of the favour and the blessing of the Almighty, defeat is sure to be the result. Place a mere soldier to deliberate, and he will laugh to scorn such thoughts as these: he will say, the power of twenty thousand men is expressed by their number; be they idolaters or worshippers of God, be they Protestants or be they Papists, these distinctions make not the slightest possible difference. "I have found by experience," he will say, "that their force is just alike." His mind never having been habituated to look beyond results, he will not be able to appreciate the spiritual influence that was connected with national faithfulness, at the time when his victories were won; or the great national purposes, involving the integrity of the national faith, which led unknown to him to the success of the warfare in which he was engaged. All these things the military structure of his mind would make light of, and as the result of this state of mind he would be likely to advise an organisation of forces in total indifference to the dictates of the Word of God.

Can we avoid attributing to some such infatuation as this the vast amalgamation of Papists in the present military force of Great Britain? I am convinced that the idea which I suggest is of vast importance; and if it be important in relation to the regular troops, it is equally important, if not more so, when considered in reference to the composition of our immense police force, on the integrity of which so much depends.

It is very possible that if a Christian man in the cabinet—supposing such a one to be there—hinted at considerations similar to the above, he would be at once put down by a "pooh! moonshine, and nonsense," of the iron duke; but do you suppose, reader, that Gregory XVI. would think little of the matter? Do you suppose that the cardinals would do so? Do you imagine that the thing does not enter into the calculations of Dr. M'Hale; ay, and of the "Conservative" Dr. Mur-

ray, too, and of all their priests? Do you suppose that a bird in the air never chirps to the same tune in the ears of Daniel O'Connell and the Repealers? If you do not, you are not the man I take you for. Allow me to lay before you an extract from one of the last numbers of the *Tablet*:

The duty of the soldier is not confined to the person of his commanding officer, nor even to the Articles of War. The law of the realm is more than both of these put together. With his red coat he assumed a new character, yet he did not, with his coloured clothes, put away his former character. He is both soldier and citizen. He is not only soldier and citizen—he is a Catholic. *His duties to religion are ever paramount to those he owes to the State.* In endeavouring to discharge the latter, he is bound to seek from the church the same helps and counsels he is accustomed to receive from her in his other relations of life. Such are his duties. His rights are co-relative with these. If he is bound to ask the directions of his confessor, the latter is bound to impart them. "The lips of the priest shall keep knowledge." There is no reservation in this promise. *There is no department of duty upon which the priest is not authorised—nay, required—to give counsel to his flock.* Moral theology, ethics, politics, or by whatsoever names duty may be sought to be expressed, the penitent is bound to demand, and entitled to receive, from the confessional, the solution of his doubts, and the enlightenment of ignorance.

We are ashamed to dwell farther on these truisms. That we have mentioned them at all is not our fault. *By our military and other lay correspondents*, these difficulties of detail and expediency have been so frequently and so confidently urged in answer to our recent appeal to their principles, that we felt ourselves compelled to notice them.

We do not—we never did—assert that the common soldier, or even his more enlightened officer, must, at the commencement of every war, for himself determine that it is a righteous war before he can engage in it. *But we do assert, that he is bound to have the point determined for him by those who, before God, are answerable for his soul.* If this plain truth be not an answer to such objections, we refer those who make them to their catechism.

And if these very plain hints do not convey a world of important matter to you, my honest friend, your skull must be almost as thick as that of Mr. Grey V. Porter! Do you observe! these are merely three paragraphs out of many such. The Popish journalist has made a "recent appeal to their principles"—"the principles," namely, of his readers—and all in the same strain; and the result has been, that his "military and other lay correspondents have, frequently and confidently, urged difficulties of detail and expediency" upon him (the *Tablet*). "His military correspondents" were, of course, exceedingly anxious on the subject of being, by possibility, arrayed against their brethren the Repealers, or against their Popish confederates in the French army. Should their dearly-beloved Prince Joinville be wafted, upon some foggy or tempestuous night, to their heretical coasts, and sorely puzzled with these "difficulties of detail and expediency;" to wit, whether they should load their muskets with blank cartridge, or whether they should fling them down altogether, or whether it might not be a better solution of the "difficulty," to discharge them at once upon their heretical officers; sorely puzzled by "all these details," and "these difficulties," they were compelled to write "frequently"

and "confidently" to "their *Tablet*;" and "their *Tablet*" answered them that it would not be quite safe to publish "treason" in a newspaper, but that they might have it for nothing at all from "their confessors:" those "who, before God, were answerable for their souls."

The blindness, the folly, and the infatuation that have prepared us for judgment, are actually inconceivable! *

A commander-in-chief is just as likely to be unfit to give counsel as to the policy which should decide the great business of national warfare, as a coachman is unfit to advise his master as to where he should drive his carriage; he is a very proper person, indeed, to determine on the best mode of getting to the point decided on, but for the making of the decision itself, it is more than probable that he is altogether unqualified.

Moreover, the whole life of a great general has been employed in securing victories; this has been the object of his existence; success has been the point with him; the mode of achieving it, as far as respects principle, he has been habituated to regard as quite a subordinate matter; deceit, guile, stratagem, and snares of all sorts, ambuscades, and covert ways, the enormous sacrifice of human life, present no feature inconsistent with their employment. Conscientious scruples, that might in the commencement of his career have been entertained, have, as a matter of course, been stifled; and a state of feeling produced, which regards everything of the sort, not with antipathy, but with approbation. Such a school as this, therefore, may be pronounced the most unfit school imaginable for a British statesman. An individual brought up in the army, and its chief and distinguished commander introduced into the cabinet, so far from being valuable in proportion to his military talents, his long experience, his great influence, his favour with foreign potentates, and his highly-applauded habits of business, will, in this very proportion, be likely to be detrimental to the public weal. The prestige of his renown will enable him to overbear his ministerial colleagues, and to induce them to suppose that they shall be quite justified in introducing into the cabinet the tactics and the policy of the camp and of the field.

Now the truth of the matter is, that all these evils have been realized to the country since the Duke of Wellington has been admitted into the cabinet. The carrying of their measures seems now the one single object of our statesmen; they seem, moreover, to be just as little concerned about the principle of these measures, as a captain of dragoons might be supposed to be about the justice of the war in which he was leading his troop to charge the enemy; in fact, this has been precisely the character of Sir Robert Peel's parliamentary tactics—all is concealment in the first instance; there is the most careful consideration of the best mode of enabling him to take the public by surprise; not a

* The view suggested here is equally applicable to admixture of Papists in the police force. In that force they are in a great majority. The case of John Flint and its circumstances, as before stated, bear upon the subject.

syllable is breathed about the details of his policy, nor about the policy itself, till the very last moment. Support is then secured from every possible source—Whig and Radical, Papist and Infidel. Not a moment's time that can with anything like decency be denied, is afforded for deliberation. The public are treated as an inconsiderable rabble; the remonstrances of religious men, instead of producing any disposition to hesitate, are declared to be the very reason on account of which the measures they oppose shall be carried. And why all this? Why, because the commander-in-chief sees a "cloud rising in the west," and is told that there are "seven millions" clamorously demanding measures of injustice and of wrong; and because, perhaps, he has got some private hints that the Popish soldiers in a war, the unsuccessful issue of which might promote Repeal, would manifest a dangerous disaffection to British interests. All this, which a Christian mind would regard as mere rubbish—which Christian principle and Christian power would enable a Christian statesman to shake off as dew-drops from a lion's mane—the mere soldier, habituated to act irrespectively of principle, magnifies into the turning points of his policy, and regards as constituting valid inducements for the adoption of the most unprincipled compromise and surrender. The history of this realm, since the Duke of Wellington was first unfortunately entrusted with political power, affords a most clear, but at the same time a most painful illustration of that wisdom of our ancestors which taught that the commander-in-chief of the military force of Great Britain was misplaced when he was transferred from the tented field to the council chamber.

The proverb, then, of the Duke of Wellington, that "he should not interfere where he has no control," involves much that is absurd, much that is dangerous, and much that is characteristic of military despotism. The truth is, in our free constitution every man is entitled to consider himself as invested with a certain share of "controlling" influence, which he is warranted to exercise with respect to *everything* that affects the public weal. The influence may be very low in its degree, but it is by no means inconsiderable in its importance. It cost no small amount of exertion to secure it; its obtainment involved the outpouring of oceans of rich and holy blood; it was the result of centuries devoted to the laborious exercise of that public spirit for which Englishmen are renowned, which is the proper fruit of Protestantism, and to gain which more than one throne was overturned—more than one dynasty displaced. It is my humble prayer, that a sense of the importance of the controlling power of British citizens may more and more pervade the public mind; that every Protestant artisan may consider himself as, in his measure, responsible for the public good, and for all those grievances which may afflict any the humblest of his brethren in the faith.

In order that each of my readers may clearly understand the liberties, the privileges, and the rights which have been won for us by

Protestantism, and which have been entrusted to our safe keeping, I here present them all with a full copy of the Bill of Rights, which I trust they may not only study themselves, but teach to their children and their children's children.

On the 13th of February, 1689, the Prince and Princess of Orange, being seated on two large chairs under a canopy of State, both Houses of the Convention—the House of Lords and the House of Commons, then called a *convention*, because there was no king at the time, James the Second having abdicated, and William and Mary not being as yet nominated joint sovereigns of the realm, and the act of a reigning sovereign being demanded to constitute a legal *parliament*—waited upon them in a full body to offer them the crown; but before they proceeded to this solemn offer, they caused the clerk of the crown to read the “Declaration of Rights,” which is embodied in the following Act, and which is enclosed within inverted commas. The bill did not pass, nor become law, until the 16th of December, A.D. 1689. Here it is—

THE BILL OF RIGHTS.

AN ACT DECLARING THE RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES OF THE SUBJECT, AND SETTLING THE SUCCESSION OF THE CROWN.

Whereas the lords spiritual and temporal, and commons, assembled at Westminster, lawfully, fully, and freely representing all the estates of the people of this realm, did, upon the 13th day of February, in the year of our Lord one thousand six hundred and eighty-eight, present unto their majesties, then called and known by the names and style of William and Mary, Prince and Princess of Orange, being present in their proper persons, a certain declaration in writing, made by the said lords and commons, in the words following, viz.:

“Whereas the late King James the Second, by the assistance of divers evil counsellors, judges, and ministers employed by him, did endeavour to subvert and extirpate the Protestant religion and the laws and liberties of this kingdom.

“1. By assuming and exercising a power of dispensing with and suspending of laws, and the execution of laws, without consent of parliament.

“2. By committing and prosecuting divers worthy prelates for humbly petitioning to be excused from concurring to the said assumed power.

“3. By issuing and causing to be executed a commission under the great seal for erecting a court called ‘the court of commissioners for ecclesiastical causes.’

“4. By levying money for and to the use of the crown, by pretence of prerogative, for other time, and in other manner than the same was granted by parliament.

“5. By raising and keeping a standing army within this kingdom in time of peace, without consent of parliament, and quartering soldiers contrary to law.

“6. By causing several good subjects, being Protestants, to be disarmed, at the same time when Papists were both armed and employed contrary to law.

“7. By violating the freedom of election of members to serve in Parliament.

“8. By prosecutions in the court of King’s Bench, for matters and causes cognisable only in parliament, and by divers other arbitrary and illegal courses.

“9. And whereas of late years, partial, corrupt, and unqualified persons, have been returned and served on juries in trials, and particularly divers jurors in trials for high treason, which were not freeholders.

“10. And excessive bail hath been required of persons committed in criminal cases, to elude the benefit of the laws made for the liberty of the subjects.

“11. And excessive fines have been imposed, and illegal and cruel punishments inflicted.

"12. And several grants and promises made of fines and forfeitures, before any conviction or judgment against the persons upon whom the same were to be levied.

"All which are utterly and directly contrary to the known laws, and statutes, and freedom of this realm.

"And whereas, the said late King James the Second, having abdicated the government, and the throne being thereby vacant, his highness the Prince of Orange (whom it hath pleased Almighty God to make the glorious instrument of delivering this kingdom from Popery and arbitrary power) did, by the advice of the lords spiritual and temporal, and divers principal persons of the commons, cause letters to be written to the lords spiritual and temporal, being Protestants; and other letters to the several counties, cities, universities, boroughs, and cinque-ports, for the choosing of such persons to represent them, as were of right to be sent to parliament, to meet and sit at Westminster upon the two and twentieth day of January, in this year one thousand six hundred and eighty-eight, in order to such an establishment, as that their religion, laws, and liberties might not again be in danger of being subverted; upon which letters elections have been accordingly made.

"And thereupon the said lords spiritual and temporal, and commons, pursuant to their respective letters and elections, being now assembled in a full and free representative of this nation, taking into their most serious consideration the best means for attaining the ends aforesaid; do, in the first place, (as their ancestors in like case have usually done,) for the vindicating and asserting their ancient rights and liberties, declare:

"1. That the pretended power of suspending of laws, or the execution of laws, by regal authority, without consent of parliament, is illegal.

"2. That the pretended power of dispensing with laws, or the execution of laws, by regal authority, as it hath been assumed and exercised of late, is illegal.

"3. That the commission for erecting the late court of commissioners for ecclesiastical causes, and all other commissions and courts of like nature, are illegal and pernicious.

"4. That levying money for or to the use of the crown, by pretence of prerogative, without grant of parliament, for longer time or in other manner than the same is or shall be granted, is illegal.

"5. THAT IT IS THE RIGHT OF THE SUBJECTS TO PETITION THE KING, AND ALL COMMITMENTS AND PROSECUTIONS FOR SUCH PETITIONING ARE ILLEGAL.

"6. That the raising or keeping a standing army within the kingdom in time of peace, unless it be with consent of parliament, is against law.

"7. *That the subjects which are Protestants, may have arms for their defence, suitable to their conditions, as allowed by law.*

"8. That election of members of parliament ought to be free.

"9. That the freedom of speech and debates or proceedings in parliament ought not to be impeached or questioned in any court or place out of parliament.

"10. That excessive bail ought not to be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

"11. That jurors ought to be duly impannelled and returned; and jurors which pass upon men in trials for high treason ought to be freeholders.

"12. That all grants and promises of fines and forfeitures of particular persons before conviction are illegal and void.

"13. And that for redress of all grievances, and for the amending, strengthening, and preserving of the laws, parliaments ought to be held frequently.

"AND THEY DO CLAIM, DEMAND, AND INSIST UPON ALL AND SINGLE THE PREMISES AS THEIR UNDOUBTED RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES; and that no declarations, judgments, doings, or proceedings to the prejudice of the people in any of the said premises, ought in anywise to be drawn hereafter into consequence or example.

"To which demand of their rights they are particularly encouraged by the declaration of his highness the Prince of Orange, as being the only means for obtaining a full redress and remedy therein.

"HAVING THEREFORE AN ENTIRE CONFIDENCE THAT HIS SAID HIGHNESS THE PRINCE OF ORANGE WILL PERFECT THE DELIVERANCE SO FAR ADVANCED BY HIM, AND WILL STILL PRESERVE THEM FROM THE VIOLATION OF THEIR RIGHTS WHICH THEY HAVE HERE ASSERTED, AND FROM ALL OTHER ATTEMPTS UPON THEIR RELIGION, RIGHTS, AND LIBERTIES.

"II. The said lords spiritual and temporal, and commons, assembled at Westminster do resolve, that William and Mary, Prince and Princess of Orange, be and be declared King and Queen of England, France, and Ireland, and the dominions thereunto belonging, to hold the crown and royal dignity of the said kingdoms and dominions to them the said Prince and Princess during their lives, and the life of the survivor of them ; and that the sole and full exercise of the regal power be only in and executed by the said Prince of Orange, in the names of the said Prince and Princess, during their joint lives ; and after their deceases, the said crown and royal dignity of the said kingdoms and dominions to be to the heirs of the body of the said Princess ; and for default of such issue to the Princess Anne of Denmark, and the heirs of her body ; and for default of such issue to the heirs of the body of the said Prince of Orange. And the lords spiritual and temporal, and commons, do pray the said Prince and Princess to accept the same accordingly.

"III. And that the oaths hereafter mentioned be taken by all persons of whom the oaths of allegiance and supremacy might be required by law, instead of them ; and that the said oaths of allegiance and supremacy be abrogated.

"I [A. B.] do sincerely promise and swear, that I will be faithful, and bear true allegiance, to their majesties King William and Queen Mary :

"So help me God."

"I [A. B.] do swear, that I do from my heart abhor, detest, and abjure, as impious and heretical, that damnable doctrine and position, that princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, or any authority of the See of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any other whatsoever. And I do declare, that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate, hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm :

"So help me God."

"IV. Upon which their said majesties did accept the crown and royal dignity of the kingdoms of England, France, and Ireland, and the dominions thereunto belonging, according to the resolution and desire of the said lords and commons contained in the said declaration.

"V. And thereupon their majesties were pleased that the said lords spiritual and temporal, and commons, being the two houses of parliament, should continue to sit, and with their majesties' royal concurrence make effectual provision for the settlement of the religion, laws, and liberties of this kingdom, so that the same for the future might not be in danger again of being subverted ; to which the said lords spiritual and temporal, and commons, did agree and proceed to act accordingly."

"VI. Now, in pursuance of the premises, the said lords spiritual and temporal, and commons, in parliament assembled, for the ratifying, confirming, and establishing the said declaration, and the articles, clauses, matters, and things therein contained, by the force of a law made in due form by authority of parliament, do pray that it may be declared and enacted, that all and singular the rights and liberties asserted and claimed in the said declaration, are the true, ancient, and indubitable rights and liberties of the people of this kingdom, and so shall be esteemed, allowed, adjudged, deemed, and taken to be, and that all, and every, the particulars aforesaid shall be firmly and strictly holden and observed, as they are expressed in the said declaration ; AND ALL OFFICERS AND MINISTERS WHATSOEVER, SHALL SERVE THEIR MAJESTIES AND THEIR SUCCESSORS ACCORDING TO THE SAME IN ALL TIMES TO COME.

"VII. And the said lords spiritual and temporal, and commons, seriously considering how it hath pleased Almighty God, in his marvellous providence and

merciful goodness to this nation, to provide and preserve their said majesties' royal persons most happily to reign over us upon the throne of their ancestors, for which they render unto him, from the bottom of their hearts, their humblest thanks and praises, do truly, firmly, assuredly, and in the sincerity of their hearts think, and do hereby recognise, acknowledge, and declare, that King James the Second having abdicated the government, and their majesties having accepted the crown and royal dignity as aforesaid, their said majesties did become, were, are, and of right ought to be, by the laws of this realm, our sovereign liege lord and lady, king and queen of England, France, and Ireland, and the dominions thereunto belonging, in and to whose princely persons the royal state, crown, and dignity of the said realms, with all honours, stiles, titles, regalities, prerogatives, powers, jurisdictions and authorities to the same belonging and appertaining, are most fully, rightfully, and entirely invested and incorporated, united and annexed.

"VIII. And for preventing all questions and divisions in this realm, by reason of any pretended titles to the crown, and for preserving a certainty in the succession thereof, in and upon which the unity, peace, tranquillity, and safety of this nation do, under God, wholly consist and depend, the said lords spiritual and temporal, and commons, do beseech their majesties that it may be enacted, established, and declared, that the crown and regal government of the said kingdoms and dominions, with all and singular the premises thereunto belonging and appertaining, shall be and continue to their said majesties, and the survivor of them, during their lives and the life of the survivor of them : and that the entire, perfect, and full exercise of the regal power and government be only in, and executed by his majesty, in the names of both their majesties during their joint lives ; and after their deceases the said crown and premises shall be and remain to the heirs of the body of her majesty ; and for default of such issue, to her royal highness the Princess Anne of Denmark, and the heirs of her body ; and for default of such issue, to the heirs of the body of his said majesty ; and thereunto the said lords spiritual and temporal, and commons, do, in the name of all the people aforesaid, most humbly and faithfully submit themselves, their heirs, and posterities for ever ; and do faithfully promise that they will stand to, maintain, and defend their said majesties, and also the limitation and succession of the crown herein specified and contained, to the utmost of their powers, with their lives and estates, against all persons whatsoever that shall attempt anything to the contrary.

"IX. And whereas it hath been found by experience, that *it is inconsistent with the safety and welfare of this Protestant kingdom to be governed by a Popish prince, or by any king or queen marrying a Papist,*" the said lords spiritual and temporal, and commons, do further pray that it may be enacted, that all and every person and persons, *that is, are, or shall be, reconciled to, or shall hold communion with, the See or Church of Rome, or shall profess the Popish religion, or shall marry a Papist,* shall be excluded, and be for ever incapable to inherit, possess, or enjoy, the crown and government of this realm and Ireland, and the dominions thereunto belonging, or any part of the same, or to have, use, or exercise any regal power, authority, or jurisdiction within the same ; and in all and every such case or cases, the people of these realms shall be, and *are hereby absolved of their allegiance* ; and the said crown and government shall from time to time descend to, and be enjoyed by such person or persons, being Protestants, as should have inherited and enjoyed the same, in case the said person or persons so reconciled, holding communion, or professing, or marrying as aforesaid, were naturally dead.

"X. And that every king and queen of this realm, who at any time hereafter shall come to and succeed in the imperial crown of this kingdom, shall on the first day of the meeting of the first parliament next after his or her coming to the crown, sitting in his or her throne in the house of peers, in the presence of the lords and commons therein assembled, or at his or her coronation, before such person or persons who shall administer the coronation oath to him or her, at the time of his or her taking the said oath (which shall first happen) make, subscribe, and audibly repeat the declaration mentioned in the statute made in the thirtieth year of the reign of King Charles the Second, intituled, "An Act for the more effectual pre-

serving the king's person and government, by disabling Papists from sitting in either house of parliament." But if it shall happen that such king or queen, upon his or her succession to the crown of this realm, shall be under the age of twelve years, then every such king or queen shall make, subscribe, and audibly repeat the said declaration at his or her coronation, or the first day of the meeting of the first parliament as aforesaid, which shall first happen after such king or queen shall have attained the said age of twelve years.

"XI. All which their majesties are contented and pleased shall be declared, enacted, and established by authority of this present parliament, and shall stand, remain, and be the law of this realm for ever; and the same are by their said majesties, by and with the advice and consent of the lords spiritual and temporal, and commons, in parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, declared, enacted, and established accordingly.

"XII. And be it further declared and enacted by the authority aforesaid, that from and after this present session of parliament, no dispensation by *non obstante* of or to any statute, or any part thereof, shall be allowed, but that the same shall be held void and of no effect, except a dispensation be allowed of in such statute, and except in such cases as shall be specially provided for by one or more bill or bills to be passed during this present session of parliament.

"XIII. Provided that no charter, or grant, or pardon, granted before the three and twentieth day of October, in the year of our Lord one thousand six hundred and eighty-nine, shall be anyway impeached or invalidated by this act; but that the same shall be, and remain of the same force and effect in law, and no other than as if this act had never been made."

The following is the declaration made by our sovereigns at their coronation, referred to in clause X. of the above act.

"I [A. B.] do solemnly and sincerely in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do believe that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever; and that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary, or any other saint, and the sacrifice of the mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous. And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare that I do make this declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words read unto me, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatsoever, and without any dispensation already granted me for this purpose by the Pope, or any other authority or person whatsoever, or without any hope of any such dispensation from any person or authority whatsoever, or without thinking that I am or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration, or any part thereof, although the Pope, or any other person or persons, or power whatsoever, should dispense with or annul the same, or declare that it was null or void from the beginning."

This bill, in a form not quite so full, passed the House of Commons, and was sent up to the Lords on the 9th of May, 1689. The bill of the Commons disabled all Papists from succeeding to the crown; to this the Lords added—"or such as should marry Papists." Bishop Burnett proposed an additional clause absolving the subject in that case from his allegiance; this was seconded by the Earl of Shrewsbury, and it passed without opposition or debate. The same prelate proposed that the Princess Sophia, Duchess of Hanover, and her posterity, being Protestants, should be named in the act, next in succession to the crown, after those therein before mentioned. King

William expressed to his ministers his satisfaction with this addition ; and the bill, in the amended form, passed the Lords. It was then returned to the Commons, where it occasioned great debates, and the House disagreed to the Lords' proviso, which respected the House of Hanover. The Jacobite party in the House were unwilling to see a bill enacted which should shut out the hopes of the Stuart family ; and the republican party disliked that which seemed favourable to the prolongation of the monarchy. Influenced by these different motives, both parties combined in opposition to the bill. Several conferences took place between the two Houses, but they did not succeed in healing the breach. Meanwhile, the birth of a son to the Princess Anne, afterwards queen, the wife of George, Prince of Denmark, made the king and the Protestant party more easy on the subject of the disputed clause ; and the bill, on the next session, was introduced without it. It ultimately passed in the form above given, on the 16th of December, 1689, and speedily received the royal assent.

CHAPTER VII.

PROTESTANTISM AND LIBERTY MUST AVAIL THEMSELVES OF THAT POPULAR INFLUENCE WHICH POPERY AND SLAVERY ARE ENDEAVOURING TO PROFIT BY.

It is impossible to consider the charter of rights involved in the Act of Parliament given in the last chapter, without reflecting upon the vast responsibility which that charter imposes upon all true Protestants. In order to be fully appreciated, the Bill of Rights must be viewed in connexion with the important current of events which led to it. The more accurately the history of England be known, the more highly will that liberty be prized which was firmly established and ratified by the glorious Revolution of 1688. Extreme accuracy of information, however, as to the details of that history, is not absolutely requisite, in order to a proper appreciation of the privileges which, through that revolution, have been secured to us. It is the object of Popish advocates, to kick up a dust on the subject of the details of British history, in order, if possible, to induce the world to suppose that the subjects of the English crown were better off, more happy, and more free, during the dominance of Popery than they have since been. Lingard wrote his history of England with this express view ; and it is certain, that he has not been quite unsuccessful in inducing a number of short-sighted men, who are astray as to the great fundamentals of principle, to agree with him. Indeed, where sound principle is absent ; where fundamental truth, with the love of it, is not deeply impressed upon the mind of a man, he is capable of giving his assent to, nay, of becoming fully persuaded of the truth of paradoxes,

the admission of which would seem scarcely reconcilable with a sane state of intellect.

Look, for example, at the late William Cobbett. There is no manner of doubt but that he was a shrewd man, and clever in a variety of ways; and yet, what an immensity of delusion, absurdity, and folly, does not his "History of the Reformation" prove him, not merely to have been capable of, but actually a victim to. He raises a great outcry about the inordinate passions of Henry VIII.; the crimes and the intrigues of statesmen during that monarch's reign; the unquestionable covetousness which urged many of the nobles and others to clamour against Monasticism, while their real object was to lay hold on the spoil of the monasteries. He dwells upon the baseness by which, occasionally, illustrious character was stained; the cowardice which not unfrequently cast a shade upon the magnanimous indifference to consequences, for which, in the main, the Protestant reformers were justly celebrated; and founding a constructive case of wrong upon an aggregate of these unfavourable circumstantials, he brings in a verdict of guilty upon the Protestant Reformation in general. Making some observations upon William Cobbett, in the year 1835, in a work which I was publishing at that time, I spoke of him in the terms which follow. The passage bears so plainly upon the view which I am now laying before my readers, that I think I shall be excused for quoting it.

"How much perverseness, how much frowardness is there about the character of men! It would be unaccountable if we had not Scripture to explain to us the mystery. There we learn that 'the human heart is deceitful above all things;' a declaration which implies, not merely that men desire to deceive others, but that they deceive themselves.

"One would suppose that an able man, such as the late Mr. Cobbett unquestionably was, should have been able to see that he owed all the liberty in which he so much gloried, to that Reformation in England which he so much abused. What a book is his 'History of the Reformation!' He there 'makes it out,' apparently very much to his own satisfaction, that the Reformation originated solely in lust and rapacity; that it was nourished by blood; that it deluged England with inconceivable misery; that it was a system forced upon the people by the tyranny of their rulers.

"Nothing can be more satisfactory to benighted, hoodwinked, deluded Papists, and perhaps deluded infidels of all sorts, than this work of Mr. Cobbett. To the true Christian it is so absurd, so ridiculous, so weak, so puerile, that he flings it aside with disgust. He says within himself, 'Here is a poor man talking about subjects that he knows no more about than the child unborn. He wants the spiritual faculties to understand the true nature of the things that he talks so confidently on.'

"Just suppose a true Christian rising from the study of the blessed pages of inspiration—his heart full of gratitude for the truths which

he has met therein, lifted up in the spirit of prayer and supplication to that gracious God who has supplied him with such abundant means of learning the nature of the evils that he is subject to, the true road to peace and felicity here and hereafter,—in fact, through the influence of that word, fulfilled with a spirit of devotion—made one with God, and God with him, so that he does in reality experience a foretaste of the very joys that are at God's right hand in heaven; I say, conceive a man brought to this state of mind, lifted above the cares and troubles of the world, filled with a peace that the world cannot give, and conscious that, instructed by Scripture, he has attained to this blessed state of happiness solely through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; nay, further, *divinely* taught that the intrusion of any other ground of dependence whatsoever would absolutely shut him out from the peace that he enjoys, and therefore, that it would be entirely unattainable in the profession of Popery; I say, conceive a man in this state of mind to meet with Mr. Cobbett's mis-called 'History of the Reformation,' the object of which is, to disparage that great change, in consequence of certain *circumstances* connected with its introduction, and how must he feel towards the work and its writer? Just thus—'Poor creature!' and fling the book into the fire. Suppose a 'philosopher' to write a bulky volume, to prove the amazing disadvantage arising from the light and heat of the sun. He advances cogent arguments. 'It hurts the blear-eyed. It is too strong for the weak-sighted. Hundreds have died of "the stroke of the sun." It has produced maggots in meat. It has contributed to create pestilences that have devoured thousands. It has impoverished, dried up, withered, and blighted whole tracts of country that are subject to its influence.' What a fearful thing is the light and heat of the sun! How should we pity the man who could pen such absurdity! Just such is the feeling with which a true Christian reads Mr. Cobbett's paradoxes.

"And yet this gentleman was not without his utility as a public writer. There are some good things in almost the worst of his works. Although his faculties were not of that nature that enabled him to rejoice in the glorious light diffused by the spread of true religion and the overthrow of Popery, he was admirable at smelling out a grievance. The world could scarcely do without cats and owls. If these creatures cannot endure the light of the sun, they are on that very account the better calculated to nip up the rats and mice and other nasty vermin that rejoice to prey in the dark. Something of this sort was William Cobbett. If he could not apprehend a beauty, he had a wholesome relish for deformity."

Cobbett unquestionably had his use; but the manner in which he reviled the Reformation indicates the extreme narrowness of his mind; and shows that, however correct may have been his judgment on a few subjects of inferior importance, he was not qualified to offer sound opinions as to the great interests of the British nation.

To resume: I repeat that the slightest consideration of the state of

things as they existed in England during the predominance of Popery, and previously to that great moral change which was consummated by, and crowned with, the "Revolution of 1688," and the "Bill of Rights," must suffice to show a man who is sound in point of principle that the people at that time were immersed in a state of bondage and degradation. When the nobles could scarcely sign their names—many of them being absolutely obliged to affix their marks—to those documents which required their signatures, what must have been the condition of the mass of the people? Indeed, it is only necessary to examine the manuscripts of the dark ages to perceive that it was by a sedulously-cherished darkness that popes and prelates swayed the public mind. "Mystery" was stamped upon everything that emanated from those in high places. The simple reading of State documents demanded an amount of scholar-like capacity which but few could attain to. Happily, the science of the present age has placed within the reach of all the opportunity of testing the truth of this observation. A select committee of the House of Commons was appointed A. D. 1800, to inquire into the state of the public records, and to have facsimiles taken of ancient public documents, treaties, popes' bulls, &c. The late Adam Clarke, a man of great erudition and uncommon diligence, was placed by the commissioners at the head of a department; and the result has been, the production of some immense volumes filled with these documents; many of them exactly copied from the originals as it respects the writing, and accompanied with explanations, translations, &c. A glance at these volumes will be quite sufficient to enable the observer to sweep from his mind as mere rubbish the sophistries of such reasoners as Lingard and Cobbett; and to convince him that Popery was coeval with a system of prevalent barbarism, which it was calculated to cherish and maintain: it will explain the fact of the supremacy of ecclesiastics during those ages of darkness; in fact, the erudition necessary to leading statesmen was scarcely attainable in those days by other than churchmen; and when we look at the books which were published then—none of which would be allowed to see the light without the "*imprimatur*" (let it be printed) of an ecclesiastical canclave—when everything was sent forward "*permissu superiorum*"—it will appear to be perfect nonsense to imagine that anything which should be dignified with the name of liberty had existence at all.

The Bill of Rights, then, was the offspring of Protestantism: the privileges which it ascertained and secured are of the most valuable description possible; and if we allow ourselves to be indifferent to their employment by any acquiescence in the wretched proverb, that "religion has nothing to do with politics," we will deserve to be again enslaved, and in just judgment we may expect that we will be so. It would be but wasting the time of my readers to offer anything in the shape of proof of our unquestionable right, and therefore our religious obligation, to address the Legislature on religious questions.

The Act which I have given lays it down that it "it is the right of

the subjects to petition the king, and all commitments and prosecutions for such petitioning are illegal." *A fortiori*, it is the right of the subject to address respectful remonstrances to all those placed in authority under the crown; to urge upon them sound scriptural views with respect to measures of State, and upon anything, in fact, which concerns the public weal or the welfare of individuals. Such remonstrances, if they be correct in point of principle, must eventually succeed in their object. It is against the nature of man to persevere in a course that is manifestly indefensible, when such conduct is loudly, forcibly, and feelingly deprecated by those who are concerned in it. The highest nobleman in the land would not, nor could he, continue indifferent to the remonstrances of the lowest scullion in his kitchen, if she complained about conduct pursued towards her which was unjust and incorrect. The prevalence of truth is inevitable. However mean or defenceless the individual who urges it, he has, in fact, an advocate in the human conscience; and if this be so in a case so extreme as that which I have supposed, how much more certainly must truth prevail when it is urged by multitudes of intelligent, well-informed, and, above all, religious men! The greater number of clergy that may be mingled with them the better. The sacredness of their character, the known inflexibility of their principles, and their influence over the mind of their congregations, must inevitably give weight to the views of a community, amongst whom they take their legitimate position.

Observe the fine tone that breathes through the "Act declaring the rights and liberties of the subject;" and through "the declaration" which, presented to William and Mary, then Prince and Princess of Orange, it embodies: "We do claim, demand, and insist upon all and singular the premises, as our undoubted rights and privileges; and that no declarations, judgments, doings, or proceedings, to the prejudice of the people in any of the said premisses, ought in anywise to be drawn into consequence or example." There was "no mistake" about these Protestants of 1688; they knew their rights, and knowing, dared maintain them; they chased from the throne—and blessed be God who enabled them to do so!—the monarch who, in deference to his blind affection for Pope and Popery, ventured to set light by the demands of Scripture and of truth. Yes, they were indeed a noble race! may we never flinch from the duty of walking in their steps.

Nor were they forgetful of the source to which they owed the overthrow of Popery and arbitrary power. Mark their language: "Seriously considering how it hath pleased Almighty God, in his marvellous providence and merciful goodness to this nation, to provide and preserve their said majesties' royal persons, (William and Mary,) most happily to reign over us upon the throne of their ancestors; we render unto him, from the bottom of our hearts, our humblest thanks and praises." Yes, they took their stand upon the "Rock of Ages;" from him they derived the wisdom, the knowledge, and the power that made them triumphant; and they forgot not to place in the very

forefront of their immortal record an expression of the gratitude they owed him.

And then what a testament of valuable truth, of political truth and wisdom, in another respect, did they hand down to posterity! "We have found by experience," say these worthies, "that it is inconsistent with the safety and welfare of this Protestant kingdom to be governed by a Popish prince, or by any king or queen marrying a Papist; and therefore we resolve that every person or persons, that is, are, or shall be, reconciled to, or shall hold communion with, the See or Church of Rome, or shall profess the Popish religion, or shall marry a Papist, shall be excluded, and be for ever incapable of inheriting, possessing, or enjoying the crown and government of this realm and Ireland, or the dominions thereunto belonging, or any part of the same; or of having, using, or exercising any regal power, authority, or jurisdiction within the same; and in all and every such case or cases, the people of these realms shall be and are hereby absolved of their allegiance." O ye Protestants! impress these truths upon your children; teach them that they bear an undivided allegiance indeed to their sovereign, being a Protestant; but beware of allowing them to suppose for one single moment that that allegiance is unconditional; it is expressly, and according to law, conditional; it ceases directly the monarch of England "shall be reconciled to, or shall hold communion with, the Church or See of Rome, profess the Popish religion, or marry a Papist." The allegiance is undivided to the monarch, being a Protestant; with life and limb, with fortune, power, and property, so long as he stands in a position, profession, and feeling of hostility to Antichrist, we are bound by loyalty to serve, honour, and obey him; but if he relinquish that antagonism—if he shall "be reconciled to, or hold communion with, the Church or See of Rome, profess the Popish religion, or marry a Papist," our loyalty is instantly transferred to another man: the monarch is dead, deceased, defunct, departed. "The said crown and government instantly descend to, and must be enjoyed by, such person or persons, being Protestants, as should have inherited or enjoyed the same, in case the said person or persons so reconciled, holding communion, or professing, or marrying, as afore-said, were naturally dead." This is the law; and to gainsay or question its importance is disloyalty to the soul of the reigning prince, and to the welfare of the realm.

Mark well—this noble clause distinctly implies the existence of a moral warfare between the State of England and the See of Rome. It implies an utter hostility between these two powers; and it is vastly important that we should at length begin to rub our eyes from the profound sleep on the subject, in which we all seem to have been buried. I am convinced that had this Bill of Rights been kept in its integrity before the mind of the nation, we should never have been cursed with the incipient treason of the Emancipation Bill.

When we consider, in the light of truth, the results upon British

freedom which have flowed from Protestantism, and further reflect, that it is to the very same source all the liberty in the world is to be traced ; and when we at the same time recollect that Popery is, ever has been, and must from principle continue to be, the antagonist of constitutional freedom ; and that, in consequence, it must necessarily consider that its most important obligation—one that it is necessarily compelled to the exercise of, from a principle of self-security—is the overthrow of the British constitution ; we cannot avoid realizing the immense importance of the particular crisis in which it has pleased Providence to cast our lot. Beyond a doubt, all the freedom in the world has originated from Protestantism, and Protestantism itself had its birth-place and its proper European home in England. The liberty of America originated in England ; and that, also, is essentially Protestant. It is rather licence than liberty that exists in France, and a few other countries, which are more infidel than Roman Catholic. Protestantism seems to have demanded an island-home, a residence where it would not be constantly depreciated, as to its practical operation, by a commingling of its followers with idolaters dwelling on their borders. Strong as our party Protestantism is in Ireland, the spiritual influences of our principles are so deadened by the Popish atmosphere which surrounds us, that the condition of our country would compel us rather to question the practical results of Protestant truth, than to decide without hesitation in their favour ; and the same effect might possibly have been general, had not the primitive faith secured for itself Great Britain almost exclusively as its dwelling-place. There it grew ; there it flourished ; there it operated ; there it originated light, knowledge, and wisdom, and rendered one spot in the earth proverbial—"the envy of surrounding nations, and the admiration of the world !"

The earthly chief of the Popedom knew this, and so did its spiritual head, that is the devil ; and, consequently, to eradicate British Protestantism—utterly to overthrow and subvert it—has been the grand problem of hell and of the Vatican.

A monarch's hand, after the death of Edward VI., kindled the fires of Smithfield, and, with the faggot and the stake, proceeded to destroy those who held the principle that was antagonistic to Rome's supremacy. Had Providence granted Mary a long reign, we should all of us now, in probability, be grovelling on our hands and knees at Lough Dearg, and struggling to see who should be the most subservient slave of priestly tyranny. Had he granted her a fruitful womb, the result would have been little different. It was announced, indeed, with great state, in the month of May, in the year 1555, after the king and queen (Philip and Mary) had written to Bonner to re-kindle his zeal, that the queen believed herself upon the point of being delivered. On the 29th of that month the courtiers were in readiness to convey the news to different parts of the kingdom, and to the the various courts of Europe. William Howard, the lord admiral, was appointed to go to the Emperor of Germany ; Ratcliffe, Lord

Fitzwalter, to the French king ; Sir Henry Sidney to the king of the Romans ; and Richard Shelley to the king of Portugal. (*Strype*, tom. iii. p. 219.) In the beginning of June, a rumour was everywhere spread that Mary was delivered of a prince. The Bishop of Norwich sang *Te Deum* in his cathedral. One priest, more officious than the rest, described in his sermon the lineaments of the new-born prince ; but Providence, designing mercy for England and truth for the world, disappointed the hopes of the tyrants who occupied the throne. Mary died childless—of a dropsy—after a short and bloody reign of five years, four months, and eleven days, on the 17th of November, 1558.

Queen Elizabeth succeeded. For nearly fifty years she occupied the throne ; and through the length of her reign and the wisdom of her councils she was the instrument, under God, of conferring stability and power upon that true church which her predecessor had hoped utterly to annihilate.

The powers which favoured Popery could not find, until the fourth monarch who succeeded Elizabeth, namely James II., an instrument suited for their purpose ; so long had the goodness of God, through the barrenness of Mary, the wisdom of Elizabeth, and the strong Protestant feeling of the people during the intervening reigns, protracted the hopes of the apostate church. The unfortunate James, however, with all his heart and soul, threw himself into the project of destroying Protestantism and liberty, and of once again subduing to the court of Rome the British isles. The flight of the king, and the accession of William the Third, frustrated the machinations of the antichristian power, although they did not destroy its hopes.

The Bill of Rights, and the various acts securing the British crown exclusively to Protestants, may naturally have led to the idea that an attack on liberty in these islands, to be successful, must emanate from a source more powerful even than the monarch himself ; and what source is that but the people ? Hell, therefore, with its satellites, threw itself into this work. The Papists of Ireland presented the most likely instrumentality for the effectuation of the purpose. They could constitute missionaries to England, to pervert the faith of the lower orders ; or, if this were not possible, to deteriorate their Protestant habits by the constant practice of that indifference to and contempt for scriptural truth which is the proper characteristic of Papists. They could be magnified into seven, nine, or twelve millions of fighting men—into “ the sole population of Ireland,” whose imaginary power might operate the most important effects in the policy of England. They might be made the means of gradually sending a brigade of latitudinarian Protestants into the House of Commons, whose tirades in favour of liberty might be made subservient to the advancement of the most monstrous slave-power the world ever groaned under.

The powers of Rome had found that it was of dangerous consequence to seduce a monarch to their service ; that the ruin of a crowned head, or the subversion of a dynasty, served different purposes from those which they wished to advance ; and they concluded that that

work could be more safely accomplished through the instrumentality of a treacherous minister—one who should make expediency, and not principle, his rule, and on whom vengeance, popular vengeance, could scarce procure to be inflicted a more weighty punishment than dismissal, than it could through a monarch whose professed Popery might cost him his crown, if not his head.

In a word, the object of Popery has been to bumble and to enslave Great Britain; to bring into neglect those scriptural precepts, the national practice of which exalted her above all the kingdoms of the earth; to withdraw from her peasantry the privilege of sitting in peace, each beneath his own vine and his own fig-tree, and to reduce them "to live on a coarser kind of food;" to destroy their prosperity, to humble their independent spirit, to annihilate the right of the poor, and to make poverty a crime; in short, to render that worldly success which had crowned their faithfulness, the idol of the idolatry of their great men; and to make Mammon usurp in their breast the place that rightfully was the temple of the Lord. The conclusion was, that by beginning with the monarch, they had gone in a wrong way to subdue the people; that by a cunning use of popular rights those same rights might be destroyed and bondage brought in. It would seem as if the calculation were but too accurate!

To us, then, is committed the task of learning the progress downward that has been made, and of remedying the mischief which has been done; and this can only be effected by properly apprehending the responsibilities with which the possession of Protestant liberty has invested us, and of diligently fulfilling the duties which it demands.

Even though the speaking of the truth in the ears of our princes involved danger, it should still be spoken, however distasteful to them it might be. The length of time in which there has been a prevalent habit of speaking smooth things in reference to the Popish system, has had a tendency to make the truth distasteful. We are just the more imperatively required to speak it out, with such a distinctness as that there can be no misapprehension on the subject. Burnet tells us, in the sixth book of his *History of the Reformation*, part iii., that on the 20th of May, 1559, an English divine, Dr. Cox, wrote to Weidner, a divine of Zurich, whom he calls a venerable old man, thus: He tells him, "that they found the short reign of Queen Mary had had such an effect in hardening the minds of the people in their superstition, that it would not be easy to change the nation." [What would the effect have been, had her reign been a long one?] "Great opposition, was made to every good motion by the Scribes and Pharisees in the House of Lords; for there were none there who could maintain argument against the bishops." [Ay, and the bishops at the present day would be encountered by nothing but vain "opposition," devoid of "argument," if they stood up, as they ought to do, for Protestant ascendancy. Soon would such a course of conduct on their part betray the "Scribes and Pharisees" who have surrendered the "right of the

poor," and brought the peasantry of England "to live on a coarser sort of food."] "But the divines, who were returned from their exile, were called to preach at court, before the queen, where they plainly affirmed that the Pope was Antichrist, and that the traditions of the Papists were blasphemies. Some of the nobility came over to them every day, and many of the people," [yes, and if such faithful doctrines were now preached before the queen, soon would it tell upon the Popish nobility, and lower orders too; but a miserable compromise is prevalent, and they that stand out to protest against it are viewed but as "troublers of Israel;"] "but not one of the clergy: they all stuck together as a body that could not be moved." [And yet the faithful preaching which Elizabeth heard resounding through her court soon moved these clergy, so that in a short time all of them, with but few exceptions, abandoned Antichrist with his "blasphemous traditions."]

What the times then demand is, loud and incessant denunciation of Popish idolatry. The whole Protestant community should constitute one vast association, which, as with the voice of a trumpet, should proclaim into the ears of the queen and of her ministers, such truths as those with which the people of Scotland aroused the occupants of the Scottish throne, in the times of John Knox. They were not defended then by such a Bill of Rights as we all now enjoy; they had not a Protestant queen to address, who could not be offended by plain speaking—one who had herself, at her coronation, "solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, professed, testified, and declared, that the sacrifice of the mass, as now used in the Church of Rome, was superstitious and idolatrous;" but they had to brave the rage of a professed Papist, who was by no means scrupulous in dealing with her enemies.

The documents which I here give afford such a noble specimen of plain speaking, and read such a lesson to the Protestants of the present day, as to the mode of their dealing against Popery, that I trust my readers will feel gratified by being put in possession of them. They are printed amongst the records which are given at the end of Burnet's *History of the Reformation*. I have, however, modernised the spelling, in order that every difficulty in reading and understanding these valuable remains may be removed. The remonstrances were addressed to Mary Queen of Scots.

These are the Articles which the Nobility, Barons, Gentlemen, Burgesses, and other professors of Christ's Gospel crave with all humility of the Queen's Majesty and her Honourable Council within this Realm of Scotland.

First—That the papistical and blasphemous mass, with all papistry, idolatry, and pope's jurisdiction, be universally suppressed and abolished throughout this whole realm, not only in the subjects, but also in the Queen's Majesty's own person, with punishment against all persons that shall be deprehended to transgress and offend in the same: and that the sincere Word of God and Christ's true religion now presently received may be established, approved, and ratified throughout the whole realm, as well in the Queen's Majesty's own person as in the subjects, without any impediment. And that the people be astricted to resort upon the Sundays, at least, to the prayers and preaching of God's Word, like as they were astricted before

to resort to the idolatrous mass : and these heads to be provided by Act of Parliament, with the consent of the estates, and ratification of the Queen's Majesty.

Secondly—That sure provision be appointed for sustentation of the ministry, as well for the time present as for the time to come ; and that such persons as are publicly admitted to the ministry may have their livings assigned unto them in the towns where they travel, or, at the least, next adjacent thereto ; and that they have not occasion to crave the same at the hands of any others. And that the benefices now vacant, or that have been vacated since the month of March, 1558, or that hereafter shall happen to be vacant, be dispensed to qualified and learned persons, able to preach God's Word, and to discharge the vocation concerning the ministry by trial, and admission of the superintendents ; and that no bishopric, abbacy, priory, deaconry, provost, or any other benefice having many churches annexed thereto, be dispensed altogether, at any time to come, to any one man ; but at the least, the churches thereof be severally dispensed, and to several persons ; so that every man having charge may serve at his own church according to his vocation. And to this effect, that the glebes and mansees be given to the ministry ; that they may make residence at their churches, whereby they may discharge their consciences, conform to their vocation, and also that the churches may be repaired accordingly : and that a law be made and established hereupon by Act of Parliament, as has been said.

Thirdly—That none be permitted to have charge of schools, colleges, or universities, or yet privately or publicly instruct the youth, but such as shall be tried by the superintendents or the visitors of the church, found sound and able in doctrine, and admitted by them to their charges.

Fourthly—For sustentation of the poor, that all lands founded to hospitality of old be restored again to the same use : and that all lands, annual rents, or any other emoluments pertaining any ways formerly to the Friars of whatsoever order they had been, or annual rents, altarage, obits, pertaining to the priests, be applied to the sustentation of the poor, and upholding of schools in the towns and other places where they lie.

Fifthly—That all such horrible crimes as now abound in this realm without any correction, to the great contempt of God and his Holy Word, such as idolatry, blasphemy of God's name, manifest breaking of the Sabbath-day, with witchcraft, sorcery, and enchantment, adultery, incest, manifest whoredom, maintenance of brothels, murder, slaughter, rife, and spoliation, with many other detestable crimes, may be severely punished ; and judges appointed in every province or diocese for execution thereof, with power to do the same, and that by Act of Parliament.

Lastly—That some order be devised and established for the ease of the poor labourers of the ground, concerning the reasonable payment of their teinds, and setting of their teinds to any over their heads, without their own advice and consent.

The Queen's Majesty's Answer to the Articles presented to her Highness by certain Gentlemen in the name of the whole Assembly of the Kirk.

To the first—desiring the mass to be suppressed and abolished, as well in the head as members, with punishment against the contradictors ; as also that religion now professed be established by Act of Parliament—it is answered—First, on the part of her Majesty's self, that her highness is yet noways persuaded in the said religion, nor yet that any impiety is in the mass ; and therefore believes that her loving subjects will in no way press her to receive any religion against her conscience, which should be to her continual trouble, by remorse of conscience, and thereby a perpetual inquietude. And to deal plainly with her subjects, her Majesty neither will nor may leave the religion wherein she has been nourished and brought up, as she believes the same to be well grounded ; knowing (besides, the grudge of conscience, if she should receive any change in her own religion) that she should lose the friendship of the King of France, the ancient ally of this realm, and of other great princes, her friends and confederates, who would take the same in evil part, and of whom she may look for their great support in her necessities : and having found no other consideration that may contravene the same, she will be loath to put in hazard the loss of all her friends in an instant. She prays all her loving subjects,

seeing they had experience of her goodness, that she has neither in time past, nor yet means hereafter, to press the conscience of any man, but that they may worship God in such manner as they are persuaded to be the best ; that they will likewise never press her to offend her own conscience. As to the establishment in the body of the realm, these yourselves know, as appears well by your articles, that the same cannot be done by the only consent of her Majesty, but requires necessarily the consent of the three estates in parliament. And therefore, so soon as the parliament is holden, that thing which the three estates agree upon amongst themselves her Majesty shall grant the same unto you ; and always shall make you sure that none shall be troubled for using themselves in religion according to their conscience ; so that no man shall have cause to doubt that for religious causes men's lives or heritage shall be in hazard.

To the second article—That her Majesty thinks 'it noways reasonable that she should defraud herself of so great a part of the patrimony of the crown as to put the patronage of the benefices forth of her own hands. For her own necessity, in bearing of her own and the common charges, will require the retention of one good part in her own hands. Nevertheless, her Majesty is well pleased that consideration being had of her own necessity, and what may be sufficient for the reasonable sustentation of the ministers, that special assignation be made to you in places most commodious, with which her Majesty shall not interfere, but suffer the same to come to them.

The answer of the rest of the articles is referred to the parliament.

The Kirk's Reply to the Queen's Majesty's Answers, aforesaid.

First—Where her majesty answers that she is not persuaded in the religion ; neither that she understands any impiety in the mass, but that the same is well grounded, &c. This is no small grief to the Christian hearts of her godly subjects ; considering that the trumpet of Christ's Gospel has been so long blown in this country, and his mercy so plainly offered in the same ; that her majesty yet remains unpersuaded of the truth of this our religion ; for our religion is nothing else but the same religion which Christ in the last day revealed from the bosom of his Father ; whereof he made his apostles messengers, and which they preached and established amongst his faithful, to continue till the second coming of the Lord Jesus, which differs from the impiety of the Turks, the blasphemy of the Jews, and vain superstition of the Papists, in this, that only our religion has God the Father, his only Son our Lord Jesus, his Holy Spirit, speaking in his prophets and apostles, for authors thereof ; and the doctrine and practice for ground of the same. The which assurance no other religion upon the face of the earth can justly allege, or plainly prove ; yea, whatsoever assurance the Papists have for their religion, the same has the Turk for maintenance of the alkoran ; and the Jews far greater for the defence of their ceremonies, whether it be antiquity of time, consent of people, authority of princes, great number or multitude consenting together, or any other such like cloaks that they can pretend. And, therefore, as we are dolorous that her majesty in this our religion is not persuaded, so most reverently we require in the name of the Eternal God, that her highness would embrace the means whereby she may be persuaded in the truth ; which presently we offer unto her grace, as well by preaching of his word, which is the chief means appointed by God to persuade all the chosen children of his infallible verity, as by public disputation against the adversaries of this our religion, the deceivers of her majesty, whensoever it shall be thought expedient to her grace. And as to the impiety of the mass, we dare be bold to affirm that in that idol there is great impiety ; yea it is nothing else but a mass of impiety from the beginning to the ending. The author or sayor, the action itself, the opinion thereof entertained, the hearers of it, gazers upon it and before it pronounce it to be blasphemy, and commit most abominable idolatry, as we have ever offered, and yet offer ourselves most manifestly to prove ; and where her majesty esteems that the change of her religion should dissolve the confederacy and alliance that she has with the king of France and other princes, &c.

Assuredly, Christ's true religion is the undoubted means to knit up surely perfect confederacy and friendship with him that is King of Kings, and who has the hearts

of all princes in his hands, which ought to be more precious unto her majesty nor the confederacy of all the princes of the earth ; and without which, neither confederacy, love, nor kindness, can long endure.

Concerning her majesty's answer to the second article, wherein she thinks it noways reasonable to defraud herself of her patronage of the benefices which her majesty esteems to be a portion of her patrimony. And that her majesty is full-minded to retain a good part of the benefices in her own hands to support her common charges. As to the first point, our mind is not that her majesty, or any other patron of this realm, should be defrauded of their just patronages ; but we mean, that whensoever her majesty, or any other patron, does present any personage to any benefice, that the parson presently should be tried and examined by the learned men of the kirk ; as appertaineth to the superintendents appointed thereto. And as the presentation of the benefices appertaineth to the patrons, so ought the collation thereof by law and reason appertain to the church ; of the which collation the kirk should not be defrauded more nor the patrons of their presentation ; for otherwise, if it shall be lawful to the patrons absolutely to present whom they please without trial or examination, what then can abide in the kirk of God, but mere ignorance, without order ? As to the second part, concerning the retention of a good part of the benefices in her majesty's own hands, this point appears so far from good conscience, as well of God's law as from the public order of all common laws, that we are loth to open up the ground of the matter by any long circumstances. And, therefore, most reverently we wish that her majesty would consider the matter with herself, and with her wise council, that howsoever the patronages of the benefice may appertain to herself, yet, the retention thereof in her own hands, undispensing them to qualified persons, is both ungodly, and also contrary to all politic order, and for final confusion to the poor souls of the common people, who, by this means, should be deprived of their salvation. And where her majesty concludes in her second answer, that she is content that a sufficient and reasonable sustentation of the ministers be provided to them by assignation in places most commodious and easiest to them, consideration being had of her own necessity. As we are altogether desirous that her grace's necessity be relieved, so our duty craves that we should notify to her grace, the true order that should be observed in this behalf, which is this—the teinds are properly to be reputed to be the patrimony of the kirk, upon which before all things, they that travel in the ministry thereof, and the poor indigent members of Christ's body, are to be sustained ; the kirks also repaired, and the youths brought up in good letters ; which things being done, then other necessity reasonably might be supported according as her majesty and her godly council could think expedient. Likewise, we cannot but thank her majesty most reverently for her liberal offer of assignations to be made to the ministers for their sustentation ; which nevertheless, is so generally conceived, that without more special condescending upon the particularity thereof, no expectation is able to follow thereupon. And so to conclude with her majesty at this parliament, we desire most earnestly the performance of the said articles, beseeching God, that as they are reasonable and godly in themselves, so her majesty's heart, and the estates, jointly convenient, may be inclined and persuaded to the performance thereof.

The Supplication to the Queen's Majesty of Scotland.

To the Queen's most excellent Majesty, her grace's humble subjects, professing the Gospel of Christ Jesus within this realm, wisheth long prosperity, with the spirit of righteous judgment.

It is not unknown unto your majesty that within this realm the Gospel of Jesus Christ was lately planted, and the true religion established ; idolatry, to wit, the masses, and all that thereto appertaineth, together with the usurped and tyrannical power of that Roman Antichrist, called the Pope, so suppressed, as well by the mighty power and hand of God, as by just laws and decrees of parliament, that none within this realm durst, in public, have gainsaid the one, nor maintained the other. It is further known that such as in whose hands God of his mercy had

prospered the beginning of this his work, were going forward to an exact and perfect reformation, concerning the policy of the church, according to the word of God, and sustentation of them that travel in the same. But these now, our most just and godly beginnings have been staid and troubled near the space of four years, to the great grief of all godly hearts within this realm. Shortly after your grace's arrival, was that idol, the mass, erected again: and thereafter were wicked men, enemies to Christ Jesus and his holy Gospel, reposed in the places which they never possessed, and were admitted to receive the fruits that by no just law can appertain to them; and that under colour they should pay their thirds to your majesty's comptroller and such as he should depute for the receiving of the same, to the end, as we understand, that our ministers and ministry might have been planted and sustained according to God's commandment. And albeit, we were plainly forewarned that such beginnings would not have an happy end; yet, the love that we bear to the tranquillity of your realm, and experience and hope that we had, that God of his mercy would mollify your highness's heart to hear his blessed Gospel publicly preached; we quietly passed over many things that were in our hearts, as also many times by our supplications unto your majesty we desired to have been redressed; but how little we have profited to this day both great and small amongst us begin now to consider. For laws we see violated, idolatry increased, your highness's own gates (against proclamations) made patent to the foolish people, to commit idolatry; the patrimony of the church we see bestowed upon persons most unworthy, and to other uses than was at first intended: and thereby, the tyranny of that Roman Antichrist to be intruded upon as again; our ministers brought to extreme poverty; some of them troubled in their function, some preachers hurt, and no redress made. Fornication, adultery, incest, murder, sorceries, bewitcheries, and all impiety, so abound universally within this your highness's realm, that God cannot long spare to strike the head and the members, unless speedy repentance follow. We, therefore, now, continuing in our former humble state, most humbly require of your majesty a speedy reformation of the enormities aforesaid, and a favourable answer to our just petitions—as more fully your majesty may perceive in the articles—most humbly beseeching your highness to have this opinion of us; that, as to this day, your grace has found nothing in us, but due obedience to your majesty's laws and authority, which we have given, because we are the only part of your people that truly fear God—so to esteem us, that God, his Christ Jesus, and his true religion, which we profess, and which by his grace shall be to us more dear than lives, possessions, or respect of prosperity. And therefore, yet again, we, the whole body professing Christ Jesus within this realm, humbly crave of your majesty that you give us no occasion to think that you intend nothing but the subversion of Christ Jesus, his true religion, and, in the overthrow of it, the destruction of us, the best part of the subjects of this your grace's realm; for this, before the world, we plainly profess, that to that Roman Antichrist we will never be subject, nor yet suffer (so far as our power may suppress it) any of his usurped authority to have place within this realm. And thus, with all humble and dutiful obedience, we humbly crave your grace's favourable answer with these our appointed commissioners.

I most respectfully and earnestly press upon all my readers the attentive consideration of these monuments of the Reformation. It was such plain speaking as this which gained their liberties for our Scottish brethren, and overthrew Popery in Scotland. Surely the facts of history are more likely to be a proper guide as to the mode in which we ought to deal with Popery, than the theories of the latitudinarian philosophers of the present age. The cry is, that such language as that which these documents present to us is "unsuited to the civilised times in which we live;" and that, in order to succeed with Roman Catholics, "a moderation in point of expression must be care-

fully observed." How often have I been reproached myself for the character of the language which I employ! I have been constantly represented as a reviler—as one who resorted to abusive terms. I remember a short time since, when I was passing through Manchester, I called on a respectable bookseller there, who was in the habit of selling the *Warder* newspaper, in which he occasionally read the reports of the Dublin Protestant Association; and I asked him what he thought of the mode in which we "carried on the war?" With an evidence of ill-humour, indicative of disapprobation, he said, "What you may think in Dublin I cannot say, but we in England never expect to prevail with men by calling them;" that is, railing at them, calling them names. I repeat, such is the feeling that plain dealing with respect to Popish error at the present day, produces in the public mind; the consequence is, the remonstrances employed by divines, with respect to Popery, are as gentle as those with which Eli rebuked the misdoings of his sons. This is the fashion; this is the tone which the ordinary appeals made to parliament and the throne breathe; and what is the result? The language of the reformers overthrew a system that seemed as firmly fixed as the everlasting hills, that was propped up and supported by all the powers that then existed. They blew the trumpet long and loud, proclaiming, as with a voice of thunder, that the Pope was Antichrist, that Papistry was idolatry, and the mass a foul idol; and down fell the walls of Jericho—of the spiritual Babylon, that sat as the seven-hilled metropolis of the world! The reformers overthrew established Popery; its downfall was the result of their conduct; but what has been the result of our mild methods? The rapid growth of the evil; its uninterrupted progress towards ascendancy. I have been reproached for the language that I have habitually employed; and yet, what has been the result of that? Why that there has been, since I began to employ it, a greater number of converts from Popery in Ireland than there had been previously within the memory of man; and I am convinced, that if the Protestant community, and the Protestant press, flung to the winds their smooth phraseology; that if every Protestant pulpit denounced Popery as the foretold Apostasy, the Pope as Antichrist, and his system as blasphemous and idolatrous—if we all, in fact, adopted the language as well as the principles of the reformers, so far forth as both are warranted by Scripture—if we made the parliament and the court to re-echo with such denunciations of Popery as emanated from these honest Scotchmen, and as we are warranted by the Bill of Rights to send forward, three years and a half would not pass until the religion of Rome would be numbered amongst the "has beens" of Ireland. Indeed we should thus speak if there were no Bill of Rights to shelter us. The ancient worthies who broke the chains from off the soul of Scotland, had no such bill to defend them; yet did they boldly testify the truth to the ears of their queen; and if they, under their circumstances, thus acted, how excessively inexcusable may we be adjudged to be, if, with still weightier responsibilities, and with still less excuse for

inaction or for compromise, we be chargeable with anything of the sort!

To avoid being tedious, and to come to matters practically affecting ourselves, I shall suppress much in the shape of comment on the interesting documents given above, which comment I had intended; on the single point, in illustration of which I would put them forward, namely, the duty and necessity of exceeding plainness of speech in public addresses to the authorities on the subject of Popery, and the importance of constantly sending forward such addresses to them—they speak for themselves. Of course it will not be understood, that either I, or any other well-informed Protestant would desire, as these Scotchmen did, that “all persons deprehended transgressing and offending, by attending at the Papistical and blasphemous mass,” should be visited with punishment; or that “the people should be astricted (that is, bound by law) to resort upon Sundays, at least, to the prayers and preaching of God’s Word, like as they were before astricted to resort to the idolaters’ mass.” Of course we would repudiate any such unjustifiable intention. We would have the war against Popery to be strictly a moral one; confined to a national exposure of its antichristian character; and the mere employment of persuasion as the means of conversion to the truth. Anything in the shape of penalty for conscience’ sake every Christian Protestant must abhor. It is evident that the Protestants of the Reformation, who supposed such a method of proceeding lawful, had learned the idea of it from the church of Rome, and had not then obtained sufficient light to perceive how inconsistent it was with their own principles; indeed the passage I have just quoted proves this—“they shall be compelled by law to attend divine service in the reformed church, as they previously were compelled to attend the idolaters’ mass.” They bring into the practice of the reformed religion the customs which they had learned from the church of Rome. Let us be true to the sound principles, the unquestionably Protestant and Christian principles of these faithful men; let us be as distinct in the language with which we address the authorities, as they were, and results equally beneficial as those which flowed from their conduct will attend upon ours.

Duty calls upon us emphatically to demand such a construction of the Legislature, as shall be calculated to enable it, without obstacle, to fulfil its great duty of conveying Christian truth to the general mind.

Infidelity, in all its varieties, is a heterogenous, disunited thing; it scarcely has an object to effect. To be sure it is animated by hostility to Christian truth, and the Christian church; but it has no distinct set of principles that it promulgates itself. It has nothing in the shape of a church, the ascendancy of which it regards as a paramount object to be effected. It is highly probable, that even irreligious men in parliament, if unswayed by such a power as Popery wields, might

in considerable numbers be brought to understand the important bearing upon the public welfare which the principles of the Christian religion were likely to have; and that they would either be exceedingly weak in the opposition that they would render to the church, or else be, to some extent, even its allies. It is the system which connects with them one firm and compact body, respectable from pretences to antiquity of existence, and influential from the millions which it wields—a body whose views are directed by an able and ambitious priesthood; it is this alliance which combines, concentrates, and determines the infidel materials that are at present in the Legislature, and which, perhaps, under the most favourable circumstances, would be likely to find their way there. If there were no Popery in the British Legislature, the antichristian organisation which is now so dangerous would be broken up, and a well-disposed ministry enabled to carry out for the general good that evangelisation for which the nation languishes; and through the want of which, gaunt poverty and destitution are fast oppressing the masses, and a heartless covetousness pervading the higher ranks. Here, then, is the mighty work that is set before the faithful Protestants of the present day; the rectification of the Legislature, and the obtainment of Christian legislation at its hands; here is an object worth living and worth dying for; here is an occasion which demands the union of all faithful men, and the loud and dauntless expression of sound opinion. Our brethren in the faith are naked, and in want of all things. The happiness and the prosperity which once characterised the English cottager, have utterly vanished away. The details of their distress which constantly fill the public ear, are heart-rending. The demoralisation resulting from the state of society to which unchristian statesmanship has brought the realm, is repulsive and frightful. Is it to be wondered at that the people should be demoralised, when their rulers are infidel? A heartless, Christianless, Scriptureless poor law treats poverty as a crime, and the poor as felons. Everything like fixed principle is renounced. Truth is viewed as a thing undiscovered, and undiscoverable. Men are sent in the workhouses and other public institutions, by the authority of the State, to teach contradictory systems. Idolatry is promulgated by law, blasphemy inculcated by the national treasures. Is it any wonder, under such awful circumstances, that misery, wretchedness, and heart-breaking, should be the constant attendants and characteristics of the subjects of the British crown? A factory system, which, though to a great extent mitigated as to its evil properties, is still baneful in its operation, treats the children of the poor as though their bones and sinews were but senseless machinery. While the parents are loitering in idleness, they look to their children for the miserable pittance that is awarded for the labour that consumes them. In fact, to whatever department of society we now turn our eyes in England, we behold evidences of the God-despising, Bible-despising spirit that has admitted Papists to parliament. And here, in Ireland, what do we see? Every faithful Protestant victimised. That exclusive

dealing which is an attribute of Popery, shutting out from public favour, countenance, or support, the man who is faithful to, and zealous for, his Protestant principles; while the government, that should support the loyal man, that should countenance him who holds the truth, that should throw its shield over the head of the oppressed, actually makes the firm maintenance of truth or honest boldness in the confession of it, a ground for repulse and rejection. The mode in which Mr. Watson was visited well illustrates what I say; but in order to see the prevalence of injury, a scrutiny into the condition of the masses of the Protestants should be instituted. Surely, then, "there is a cause." Surely, loud remonstrance, bold remonstrance, general remonstrance is demanded; and, surely, the right of that remonstrance being established, and the value of that remonstrance being exemplified by the page of history, being demonstrable also from the constitution of man and from the Word of God, it is the duty of all to arouse themselves from their indifference, and to determine to stand forward as faithful citizens of their country, subjects of their queen, and servants of their God.

One point, which is strongly insisted on in the Scottish documents, is of the very greatest importance. It is one to which I feel myself in an especial manner related. The point which I allude to is this, the "antichristian" character of Popery. The Pope is there again and again called the "Roman Antichrist." This is a doctrine most plainly proveable by Scripture, and very generally assented to by Protestants; but it is denied by some. Dr. Todd, Mr. Maitland, and Mr. Burgh, with some others, the Puseyites in general, treat the principle as groundless. Now this was the identical principle with which I hewed to pieces Father Maguire; and I feel assured, that until the Protestant public be thoroughly convinced that this is not only a sound principle, but a fundamental one, it never will take the stand that is demanded by the circumstances of the times. There are different modes of assailing Popery; but I am convinced, that to ensure success against an able adversary, one method only will prove effectual. I have for a great while shrunk from urging this point, out of delicacy to some of my dear brethren, who either seem to hold different views, or else not to be thoroughly impressed with the paramount importance of those which I have brought forward; but the consequence has been, that we see the great principle of victory which was established by my discussion with Maguire, almost nullified, and the old humdrum method of detail, which fancies that Popery can be put down by an adduction of the objectionable particulars which the system involves, again rendered prevalent. I shall therefore devote the Second Part of my work to the special consideration of this point. I shall venture to urge upon my readers the paramount importance of their attacking Popery out of the Scriptures, rather than out of Popish documents; on religious rather than political grounds: a proper consideration of the subject will show that this statement involves no

contradiction or inconsistency ; and I have every confidence that the result will prove of vast importance to the church. The jealousy with which a living man is regarded, particularly when he sets himself up into anything like a position of antagonism to his contemporaries, may, perhaps, render this part of the task which I have imposed upon myself as not a little invidious ; but I write for posterity ; and I feel convinced, that when I am dead and gone it will be admitted that I was right, as it will also be seen, that in the course which I adopted I was merely walking in the path marked out for me by the Word of God, and the great lights of the church and of the world.

CHAPTER VIII.

CONCLUSION.

I shall here mark off the first division of my work. I have been governed in the course of my observations, and led along rather by feeling than by any compliance with method or system. If I may judge, however, from the nature of my own mind, I should be disposed to say that, where results upon this busy world and its overlaid denizens are looked for, precision of method is a thing of inferior consideration. I am quite convinced that if as many persons moved against Popery in Ireland, and in the United Kingdom, as loathe and would subvert it, the thing would be overthrown at once—in fact, it would have long since fallen. Countless tomes of the most systematic logic and theology, place within the reach of inquiring men abundant reasons for the utter rejection of the system. I design not that my humble volume should rank amongst such grave divinity. The occasion does not demand it ; and, perhaps, if it did, I have neither patience nor erudition successfully to engage in the work. Let me not be supposed to be less solicitous for the production of effects, because I may be thought less careful of the rules of order.

I conceive that I have thrown together some important thoughts—thoughts calculated to stir men's souls against this system of moral bondage, and in favour of the counter system of moral liberty—which are calculated to stir mens' souls, and yet, which, from their obviously simple character, have been frequently neglected by those to whom they may have occurred, or altogether passed over without observation.

The Pope and his myrmidons are extremely solicitous of leading mankind to imagine, that the comparative merits of their antichristian system and of the system of the reformed church, can only be fathomed by a profound research into very recondite literature, and they have too often succeeded in drawing Protestant inquirers, both of

the clergy and of the laity, into their patristic fastnesses. I have traversed these wilds myself to some small extent—quite sufficiently however to convince me that by far the wiser course for the majority is to keep clear of them altogether. I should be exceedingly sorry to concede to the Papists, that they could master us in any department of legitimate knowledge; let it suffice for us that great lights of our church have met them and foiled them on their own ground. One single race of Usshers and Jewels—of Cranmers, and Luthers, and Calvins—if we had only one single race of such—would have been sufficient for Protestantism. They have proved, that if we chose even with their own weapons to contend with Papists, we should still be victorious. But the times demand a different procedure; and if I do not mistake, it is likely to be acknowledged that in the course that I have here pursued in speaking of Popery, I have met the requirement of the moment.

My object has been, to bring thinking men to view the bearings of common sense upon the antagonistic principles; to show them, that if a proper mode of viewing the subject be employed, Protestantism may be seen in all the bright phases of British society, and Popery in like manner discerned in the dark phases of that of Ireland—to draw them away from books to things, from notions to realities; and, above all, from vain philosophy of every sort to the glorious Bible.

A properly instructed man will be able to see Protestantism in the steam-engine, in the printing-machine, in the electric-telegraph, in the spinning-jenny, in the power-loom—in a word, in every single circumstance which may be regarded as a feature in civilisation. My anxiety has rather been to suggest trains of thought than to follow them out. In truth I may say, I hope without profanity, that if books should be written, whose object was to exhibit in their length, and breadth, and height, and depth, that which we owe to the scriptural truths developed at the Reformation, the world itself could not contain the books that should be written. Protestantism has its origin in light and liberty. It is only necessary to regulate its outgoings by the Word of God, in order to separate it from all the evils which our negligence has rendered circumstantial to it, and which Papists are so fond of representing as being essentially inherent in the system itself.

I have endeavoured correspondingly, to produce antagonistic feelings with respect to Popery—to lead men to feel that its national prevalence is utterly inconsistent with national dignity, power, or happiness.

The views that I am insisting on are the mere results of a single principle. Let me earnestly urge thinking men to ponder upon it, and follow it out in a feeling of manliness and candour.

The principle that I allude to is this, that *it is the prevalence of truth which exalts communities—that it is the prevalence of falsehood which degrades them.*

It is, perhaps, needless to urge that this is a scriptural principle. Christ “came into the world” that he might “bear witness to the

truth." He declared to his disciples that they should "know the truth, and the truth should make them free." While he died as an atonement for sin, he laid down his life also as "a witness for the truth." It was in devoted allegiance to the truth that all the martyrs bled; and when we consider the results that have followed from their testimony, we can scarcely fail to be enthusiastic in the same noble cause for which they shed their blood. There can be no manner of doubt that the principle which I have alleged is certainly a *scriptural* one. The object of my rather rambling chapters has been, to lead men to gather that it is as reasonable as it is scriptural.

Popery degrades society. Why? Because it is false. For the very same reason Mahometanism would degrade society—Unitarianism would degrade society. In fact, what is Mahometanism but a Unitarian system? Paganism would degrade society. Just for the very same reason, because it is false. In short, the principle will hold good in all cases, without any exception whatsoever.

There is one consideration level to the meanest capacity, which cannot fail to illustrate that which I have laid down.

It is quite obvious that any society which is based on a system of religious falsehood must, in self-defence, place limits on toleration. Why so? Just because freedom of inquiry, and freedom in the expression of its results, must necessarily explode a system which is false, and revolutionise and subvert the community which is bound up with it.

Falsehood cannot exist in the midst of free inquiry and freedom of expression. A free people and a free press insure the ultimate supremacy of truth. Why does the Church of England smile upon the severest attacks of her enemies? Just because every one of them admits of the fullest and most satisfactory argumentative answer. Why does the Church of Rome require to gag the mouth of her opponents? Why does she in every possible way circumscribe their liberty? Just because she knows that the absurdities of her system are so gross, so glaring, so palpable—that they involve a cheat, a swindle, a delusion of such monstrous proportions, that she can only hold her seat upon the wreck of human liberty.

Ireland is absolutely an enslaved country. Neither Roman Catholics nor Protestants are free. The fact of its slavery demonstrates its degradation. The whole population "peeps and mutters."

"The expression of truth will offend our neighbour," "provoke the priest," "drive away a customer," "endanger our situation," "produce an attack from the press, or prove in some other way pernicious." A population that is in such a state as this cannot make progress. It wants the heart for it. There is a practical meanness inseparable from it inconsistent with dignity of national character.

My object has been to lead out the mind into such simple and obvious thoughts as these—if possible to induce men to think for them-

selves about Popery and Protestantism irrespectively of the schools; convinced that thought alone is necessary to lead to unity of feeling on either subject.

And closely in connexion with this object has been another, which will be found to be kindred with it. Having aimed at the production of unity of feeling, I have been anxious to produce, also, unity of action; and that that action should have a bearing on the State. From all that I have said, it may be fairly gathered that the popular maxim, that the Christian has nothing to say to political subjects, is a loathsome, an unconstitutional, and an unchristian maxim. Had it prevailed in past times, we never should have had the Reformation; we should have been all of us still the bond-slaves of the Pope. Indeed it is a very great question whether Christianity itself would not have been supplanted by the system of Mahomet. All those who are acquainted with the writings of the reformers, are aware that this was an alternative that was actually apprehended at the time when these great men were enabled to lift up a standard against that overflowing scourge.

Here, then, have I expended the First Part of my labours.

I next proceed to show how Popery should be assailed in order to its successful overthrow.

While in the Third Part of my work, I mean to point out the path to Christian union among Protestants.

END OF PART I.

FREE THOUGHTS ON PROTESTANT MATTERS.

PART II.

CHAPTER I.

THE ANGLICAN AND ROMAN SYSTEMS DIFFER IN ESSENTIALS.

The work committed to Irish Protestants by Divine Providence is, the eradication of Popery from their native land. This system degrades its votaries, and entails a curse upon the country in general. So long as Popery exists in Ireland, no Irishman will be able to feel that he has a country. He may be born, and bred, and live in the land; but he will be compelled, in one case, to feel that he is an alien in it; and in another, to view it as withheld from him by aliens. The Irish Protestant who does not make the eradication of Popery the subject-matter of his first and of his last thoughts, must be practically a headless, heartless, creedless being.

The question, then, is, in order to the eradication of Popery, what course must be pursued? I answer, make it manifest to all men that Popery is a loathsome delusion—a degrading system of antichristian imposture. And how is this to be done? I reply, by attacking it in the right way. Popery will actually thrive as luxuriantly if it be improperly attacked, as it will if it be not attacked at all.

I introduced a new system of attacking Popery; or, rather, let me say, I revived the true and ancient system. In my discussion with Father Maguire, I merely carried into effect a system of operation of which I had previously demonstrated the rectitude and importance. Let the result determine as to the soundness of my views.

I did not hesitate to say, and put into print, years before the discussion, that the system of attacking Popery generally adopted, was absolutely unsound, and could terminate in nothing but failure. See the *Witness*: see my introductory essay to “Mede’s Apostasy of the Latter Times.” I omit the mention of numberless occasional publications, in the form of lectures and letters, which appeared in the public journals and otherwise. I repeat, that I maintained this view previously, and that it is no less true now than ever it was.

In the ordinary mode of assailing our great Irish evil, it was not, in point of fact, Popery, or the Popish church, that was attacked, but

certain dogmas or practices of the system. I proceeded in a different way: I brought the whole of the monstrosities of the "mystery of iniquity" within the range of the whole Scripture; and the result was, the total demolition of all the outworks of delusion within which Antichrist had enclosed himself.

I am quite aware, as aforesaid, that in claiming for my own views singular importance, and thus inculpating, to a certain extent, the soundness of the principle on which Popery had been previously assailed, I expose myself to all the consequences of that natural self-love which dwells within the bosom of almost every man. I may say I stood alone in the discussion. Speaking of the clergy generally—of course there were some noble exceptions to the rule—they stood apart from me; but, perfectly certain of the invincible position I had assumed, I was nothing moved by this. The issue satisfied the whole church. All confessed that I was right. Did I see this concession acted on—did I witness an inclination to make the principle of the victory that has been won the means of further conquest, I would feel that my work was done; but perceiving that this is not the case—that there is a tendency to cling to the delusion that so long made us the victims of the evil—to proceed in the same impracticable method of warfare, which never brought anything upon Protestantism but either certain disgrace or uncertain success, I feel it due to the church, and to the great cause which I have in hand, to vindicate the soundness of my controversial views, and to explain the grounds on account of which the old system should be for ever abandoned. Until we attack Popery aright, as the Great Apostasy in fact, we may bid adieu to any prospect of deliverance for our country.

As preliminary to the matter in hand, I shall present my readers with a few documents which I think will be found interesting.

In the *University Magazine* for October, 1841, there was inserted a paper entitled "A Proposal for the Reconciliation of the Protestant and Roman Catholic Churches, by an Irish Priest." The writer did not give his name; but he solicited communications from those who might take an interest in the project; which communications he desired might be left for him at the house of the publishers. He introduced his proposal by a narrative of the facts which he stated to have originated it. It seemed that certain Roman Catholic priests, the neighbours of the person who made the "proposal," were in the habit of assembling on certain days, and at stated hours, in order to discuss those subjects which interested the public and excited general attention. In the course of one of those meetings, which were held in the evening, the Tractarian movement was the engrossing topic; and it led to the conclusion, that proper exertions might bring about a reconciliation between the opposing churches. "Evening after evening," says the writer, "this was the subject of our debate; and after duly considering the matter in all its bearings, we adopted the following resolutions:—

First—That the Protestant and Roman Catholic religions agree in all the fundamental articles of the Christian faith.

Second—That the differences of these churches are, in many cases, more apparent than real ; and the particular points of belief on which they really disagree, are really but few.

Third—As to these points, there appears now to be, on the part of some of the most distinguished amongst the Protestant divines, a disposition to come to a better understanding, and if properly encouraged, perhaps, to a final adjustment of religious differences.

Fourth—That, for the sake of peace, harmony, the general welfare and happiness of mankind, and the extension of the knowledge of Christ and his gospel throughout the world, such a final settlement of religious differences ought to be promoted, and, if possible, effectually secured.

Fifth—That considering the nature of man, which resists violence and yields to conciliation ; and knowing, from times gone by, the little good which is effected by polemical discussions, it appears to us, that this, so glorious and happy a consummation, can never be obtained, except through a spirit of Christian charity exhibited in a mutual approximation of the churches.

Sixth—That, as we before observed, such spirit having already manifested itself on the part of certain distinguished divines of the Protestant Church, we most earnestly and respectfully implore our sovereign pontiff and prelates to exhibit a similar feeling, by making, at this most seasonable juncture, such wise concessions and salutary reforms as would at once befit the times in which we live, and invite to peace and union our dissenting brethren.

Seventh—That we pressingly call on all good and liberal men of every Christian persuasion, to assist in carrying out this noble project.

Eighth—That we disclaim all connexion with the partisan and the bigot of either or any party who would seek to continue the present disastrous differences, by opposing a change which the spirit of these times would seem to call for, and the spirit of the Christian religion approve.

Ninth—We call on the Rev. Mr. ——— to give publicity to these our resolutions, through whatever means he shall deem fittest and most convenient.

These resolutions constituted the “proposal;” and amongst the concessions which the writer suggested as feasible on the part of the Roman Catholic Church, were the following. He mentions them thus:—“Amongst these salutary changes might be, the retrenchment of holydays, or their limitation to a very few days—the abrogation of fasts and abstinences, or the confining of them to the season of Lent—the dispensing of the celibacy of the clergy,” &c. He then states, that all the priests who were in the habit of meeting were unanimous as to the expediency of those changes, and proceeds—“They think, with very few exceptions, that a change as to the law of clerical celibacy, in particular, would be highly expedient, not to say absolutely necessary ; and they would hail the repeal of this part of ecclesiastical discipline, not only as a means tending to the general conciliation of the churches, but as a most wise and long-called-for reform.”

Of course, the tale about the meeting of the priests was a mere fiction ; nevertheless, the “proposal” excited a good deal of attention at the time ; and at the suggestion of one or two friends, I anonymously addressed to the writer a letter on the subject. After some introductory matter, explaining that I was a clergyman, &c., I proceeded as follows.

"When I first glanced over your letter, I concluded that it was (pray excuse me) the production of a deep Jesuit, who desired not union *with* our church, but the ascendancy of his own. I will not actually go the length of saying, that one who paints himself as an unsophisticated rural priest, bears in reality a character very much the opposite; but at the same time I must say, that the Vatican itself could not produce a diplomatist, however wily, who could make a proposition more likely to accomplish the haughtiest purposes of Rome than yours.

"Say, that entrapped (pardon the use of the term) by your professed desire for peace, any large body of our divines—sufficiently large to be supposed capable of expressing the mind of the church itself—should be brought to assent to your first proposition, 'that the Protestant and Roman Catholic religions agree in all the fundamental articles of the Christian faith.' Suppose, I say, that through your letter, our church should become compromised by anything resembling assent to such a proposition as this,—what then? Why, then, it would at once be evident that your church would have a claim to a legal establishment in Ireland. There would not be a single principle which could warrant our rulers in refusing to concede every sort of ecclesiastical superiority to a church, which, while it was unquestionably that of the bulk of the population, had accorded to it, even by its enemies, essential doctrinal rectitude.

"The nation readily assents to the dominancy of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland, because it is there in the majority; while, at the same time, it 'agrees with the Church of England in all the fundamental articles of the Christian faith:' and this would then be identically the case of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland. Do not, however, for one moment allow yourself to suppose, that if the Presbyterian Church were doctrinally heterodox, holding, for example, the anti-trinitarian heresy, that any predominancy of numbers would warrant the British nation in giving it a legal establishment within the British realm. Could the resolutions, therefore, which you have promulgated, draw an assent from our church, it would give to the Roman Catholic body a vantage ground from which to batter our establishment about our ears, as considerable as St. Dominick himself, if he were once again restored to light, or the most ambitious churchman of you all, could possibly desire. However, I grant that consequences, although we might deplore them, should not prevent us from going onward in a course which sound principle might demand, and that it would be quite unfair to throw your propositions overboard, merely because their adoption would give a great triumph to your church; if they were *true*, we should adopt them, however painful the result might be to us.

"I have here been merely arguing that a motive very different from a desire of union between the churches might have led to your proposal; that, in fact, your letter is such as might have emanated quite as much from zeal for Rome, as from a love of peace; that it should entitle you, not to that deprecation on the part of your

ascendancy-loving brethren which has been awarded to you, but to applause; that it should call forth on our side, not so much hopes of union as renewed caution against assault. It would be a very awkward thing for us to have become involved in the erection of a platform for the increase of love which could, at the moment of its completion, be made the most effectual means of accomplishing the purposes of immitigable hatred. This, you will allow, would prove a very awkward matter indeed. That it was the real motive which led to your letter was, as I have stated to you, my first impression. However, 'charity hopeth all things;' and having given you grounds from which to see that it would not be quite so easy a matter to catch us all a napping as you might have perhaps supposed, I would for the present throw suspicion overboard, and admit that you have spoken in the best faith; and that your true motive is that which it professes to be, a desire for union and a belief that it is practicable.

"Did this desire and this belief spring from an independent examination of the faith of the Catholic Church of Ireland protesting against Rome—for I trust that you will ever remember that this is the true description of our church—I would indeed rejoice at it; and, however I might feel with respect to the impracticability of your object, augur most happily as to your individual case. Be pleased to fix your attention upon the true relative position of our churches, implied in the last sentence. I do really think that a simple consideration of that one point would be likely to set you right on the whole controversy. However deplorably mistaken the opinions of Rome are in other respects, we of the Church of England accord to her an orthodoxy of sentiment on the subject of the ecclesiastical constitution much greater than we can to any of the dissenting communities, infinitely superior to her on the subject of the Christian doctrine though some of them may be. Do, then, pray bear it in mind, that ours is the ancient Catholic Church of Ireland protesting against Rome; and that your church is a branch of the Church of Rome in Ireland, attempting to silence our testimony and overthrow our establishment. I cannot be too earnest in urging you to meditate upon this important statement, and to consider it without prejudice in all its bearings. But to resume. It is, I fear, plain enough that your hopes of reconciliation have not sprung from your own examination of the great points at issue between the churches so much as from the conduct and writings of certain persons amongst us, whom you have described as 'the most distinguished amongst the Protestant divines.' Believe me, you never were more mistaken than in attaching the weight which you seem to do to the writings of those of our clergy who are popularly called Tractarians. Rest assured of the truth of what I tell you, that the approximation to your views which is denominated Tractarianism, is the abhorrence of our people both lay and clerical. I do not, however, wonder at the error into which you have been led. The Tractarians of Oxford have certainly been a very busy and a very noisy generation; and the opposition that their opinions

have drawn out has given them an *eclat* additional to that resulting from their own mischievous diligence ; so that, upon the whole, you may be easily excused for thinking that notions were generally prevalent which were almost universally talked about. Your acquaintance, however, with the history of the church, will lead you to form a more correct judgment. There have been 'nine days' wonders' in every age of Christianity. The human mind seems to have been so engrossed at various times with certain prevalent extravagances, as to lead the inexperienced to conclude that it would never be set right again. But the mania has passed away without the production of any substantive effect, and left to posterity scarce anything more than the bare record of its existence. Do not, then, allow the *fama clamosa* which has resulted from Tractarianism to lead you into the idea that there is anything like a growing disposition on the part of *our* church to look with favour upon the peculiarities of *yours*. Giving you credit, then, for the utmost sincerity in the expression of your desire for 'union' between us, or 'reconciliation,' or whatever else you may be pleased to call it, I cannot help fancying that it has been created rather by the supposed prevalence of Tractarianism, than by anything really existing in the nature of the case.

"Although the circumstances which you have glanced at for reform in your church may be considered to be rather points of discipline than of doctrine ; indeed, confined to three particulars named, the retrenchment of holydays, of abstinences, and the dispensing with the celibacy of the clergy ; and that consequently you would touch the aggregate of what we consider your evils with a very gentle hand ; all those who wish well to the cause of truth will be glad to find any body of Roman Catholic priests going even so far. I cannot but think that in particular the dispensing with clerical celibacy, if it were tolerated by your authorities, would in a short time lead to all that the most enthusiastic Protestant could desire. I feel quite sure that if the Roman clergy were brought to identify themselves with the feelings of society by the adoption of the married life, they would speedily be led to take a more common-sense view of the whole system of the Christian religion than they do, and to perceive that nothing short of decided Protestantism would be consistent with the faith of Christian people. Hence I feel gratified that you have been brought to desire, with the sincerity that your language would indicate, a change in that part of the constitution of your church ; still, be assured of it, that not one of the reforms that you have touched upon goes to the root of the matter. That you should think that our differences could be healed by such alterations shows (you will excuse me for saying so) that you have studied the whole subject rather superficially, that you are but an 'outer court worshipper' in your own church. Had you caught the spirit of your system, and known that of ours, you never could have supposed that Rome and Canterbury were so neighbourly. The truth is, that those whom you call our distinguished divines, 'are a little touched with popery,' (query, a little?) you, reverend sir, and your

clerical meeting—supposing your story true—a little infected with ‘heresy,’ and still, conceiving yourselves on the one side good Protestants, and on the other good Papists; you imagine that Popery and Protestantism approximate, when in truth it is merely the infected individuals on both sides who do. These observations will prepare you for an absolute and total denial on my part of the truth of your first fundamental proposition; and, with the denial of it, evidently your whole scheme will fall to the ground. That proposition or resolution is as follows:—‘That the Protestant and Roman Catholic religions agree in all the fundamental articles of the Christian faith.’ If this resolution could stand, your plan would be highly practicable; but it cannot—far from it. There is *essential* difference between the churches in fundamental articles; and therefore, I repeat, your design must fall to the ground.

“It were a *crambe repetita* of the most obnoxious kind to detain you with a fresh recital of the list of the evils, errors, or corruptions usually attributed to your church; I should not think of doing so. At the same time, I avow that I entertain on these points the opinion common among Protestants. I am sure that I could give you on the peculiar articles of the creed of Pope Pius IV.—to wit: tradition, the insufficiency of the Scriptures, the seven sacraments, the doctrine of justification, the mass, purgatory, the invocation of saints, the veneration of images, the power of indulgences, the supremacy of Rome, and the infallibility of the Roman Church,—all the popular Protestant arguments, and add, perhaps, others as convincing as these. To proceed, however, in this way would be as tedious as it is vulgar. I would therefore adopt a course very much shorter; yet, as I think, quite as satisfactory. The whole catalogue of your heterodoxes I believe to result from one great fundamental error. I allow that this error could scarcely exist if some of those which accompany it were done away with; and that hence these particular errors might be thought as deep rooted as that which I would regard as the great and fundamental one, and rather to originate it than to be produced by it. I know that others derive your errors from a different source. About this, however, we need not have a controversy. Let each maintain his views in his own way; I, for my part, believe that the *fons et origo malorum* of Roman error is a false doctrine of justification. Rome answers the great question, “What shall I do to be saved?” (Acts xvi.) in a manner different from the Holy Ghost. It solves improperly the great problem, ‘How shall a man be just before God?’ From this error all the corruptions of what we call Popery spring; and it is natural that it should be so. Nothing can be more evident than that the business of religion is the salvation of the soul; and that if the true church teach one way of accomplishing this most important object, a church entirely opposed to it will teach another way essentially different. Now, in the case of our two churches such is the fact. *We* teach that a man is justified ‘by faith alone, without the works of the law;’ and that no man can be justified who looks for

the blessing through faith and works combined. *You*, on the contrary, teach that works must go along with faith for justification; and that no man can be justified by faith *alone*, without good works. We hold that good works accompany salvation, and are the necessary consequence of faith; but that they are not in the slightest degree the cause of justification. You, on the other hand, hold that faith and charity must go together to entitle a man to pardon and peace.

"Now, here also it would be tedious to discuss the different texts on which we ground our several opinions. We have a host of passages to allege on our side; for example: 'We conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law.' (Romans iii. 28.) 'By grace ye are saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast,' &c. (Ephesians ii. 8, 9.) 'Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us,' &c. (Titus iii. 5.) 'Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling; not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace,' &c. (2 Timothy i. 9.) 'A man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ.' (Galatians ii. 16.) 'Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth,' &c. (Romans x. 4.) While you, on the other hand, dwell with great emphasis upon the passages in James—for example, ii. 17, 'Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone;' and ver. 20, 'Wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?' and ver. 21, 'Was not Abraham our father justified by works?' and ver. 24, 'Ye see, then, how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only;' and ver. 25, 'Was not Rahab the harlot justified by works?' &c., and ver. 26, 'As the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also.' I repeat, we severally dwell upon these passages, and hence draw our different conclusions. You know that we reconcile James to Paul, by understanding James to use the word 'justified' in the sense of proving one's self to be in a justified state; and that we are very elaborate in arguments to show that this is so. Were I addressing a layman, or even an ordinary Roman Catholic priest, I might feel myself called upon to vindicate our interpretation of these passages. But writing to one who puts himself forward as a leader in his party, I presume that he has considered the *pros* and *cons* of the question; and that he has, after due deliberation, made up his mind that the Protestant view is not the correct one. I think it only necessary, then, to such a person to say, that the two churches differ essentially on the doctrine of justification. My simple object at present is to show you, from the principle which I am urging, how totally unfounded your first proposition or resolution is. Allow me, then, to dwell for a little upon the different *results* which flow from the Protestant and Roman Catholic views of justification.

"We hold that the atonement of Christ on Calvary 'finished' all that is needful for the salvation of mankind. He there bore our sins in his own body. He was there wounded for our transgressions, and

bruised for our iniquities. 'He made there,' to use the words of our church, 'by his one oblation of himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.' The moment the sinner, feelingly convinced of his sin, believes this great truth, he is in full possession of its benefits; for the perfect enjoyment of peace nothing is required on his part, but to 'believe only.' Feeling assured that the atonement of Calvary has fully satisfied the Divine Justice, he rejoices in the tidings; he knows that the guilt of his sin is removed; that the Divine Justice itself, which he formerly trembled at, is engaged on his side; and filled full of love and gratitude to his pardoning God, the urgent question of his soul is, 'Lord, what wouldst thou have me to do?' The first appetite of his soul begins to be the fulfilment of the will of his heavenly Father—that blessed God who spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for him. He flings behind him guilty fears. Under the operation of this saving faith, he realizes, for the first time, the full meaning of that passage in the creed, which he previously repeated as mere matter of course, viz., 'I believe in the remission of sins.' He now perceives that this clause implies, not merely that sins in general can be remitted for Christ's sake, but that his sins *have been* actually remitted on that account; he knows himself to be a pardoned man, and that, as such, he is regarded with divine complacency by his heavenly Father. He is reconciled to God; and the fear of him, which before resulted from a sense of the guilt of sin and the punishment that was due to it, gives place to love, going forth from a grateful heart towards one, who has not only passed an act of pardon for the sinner, but made his own Son a sacrifice in order to be able, consistently with his justice, so to do. The language of the Christian's heart to such a God, is that of devoted affection. He cries, 'Abba, Father!' Slavish fear is driven far away. He approaches the throne of grace with a holy boldness, that he may obtain grace to help in time of need; and amid all the difficulties, all the trials, all the temptations which beset him from within and from without; amid perils in the city, perils in the wilderness, perils in the sea; amid weariness, and painfulness, and watchings, and hunger, and thirst, and fastings, and cold, and nakedness, he faints not. Why?—just because 'he has obtained mercy;' (2 Cor. iv. 1;) just because he is borne up by a sense of the divine favour, and is 'persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate him from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.' Sustained by this divine faith, he encounters the world and overcomes it—laughs at impossibilities, and says they shall be done—knows that all things work together for his good; and therefore he rejoices, not merely in the hope of the glory of God, but he glories in tribulation also, counting it all joy when he falls into divers temptations. But the faith which produces these gratifying effects in the strengthening and refreshing of the soul, operates no less marvellously in the pro-

duction of what are more popularly called *moral* results. The true believer, as an obedient child, fashions not himself according to the former lusts in his ignorance; but as He which has called him is holy, so does he also himself strive to be holy in all manner of conversation. Because it is written, 'Be ye holy, for I am holy.' As one of a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a peculiar people, he feels that he should show forth the praises of Him who hath called him out of darkness into his marvellous light. He knows that before he believed he was not, but that he now is, one of the people of God—one of those favourites of heaven, who has 'now obtained mercy;' (1 Peter ii. 10;) and as such he abstains from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul, and prevent that enjoyment of spiritual blessings, the appetite for which has been created by a living faith. The true believer knows that he has nothing to do in order to have a title to the heavenly inheritance; that everything has been already done for him by Jesus Christ; and that, therefore, he is at absolute liberty, nothing being required at his hands, and all things being lawful to him. (1 Cor. vi. 12.) Does he therefore sin? God forbid! How shall he who is dead to sin live any longer therein? He is free, but he uses not his liberty as a cloak of maliciousness, *i. e.*, as a justification of licentiousness; but, on the contrary, as a servant of God. (1 Pet. ii. 16.) Hence, the true Christian is freed from the necessity of doing anything for *himself*, or for his salvation. He need not, in order to accomplish this, macerate his body, or scourge himself, or place himself under peculiar bonds or restraints; he is called upon to do nothing for himself, for all has been done for him by Christ. His exertions are not to be directed to his justification; they are to be put forth simply for the glory of God and for the benefit of his generation. Their *motives* being, gratitude for salvation received; their *object*, the salvation and the regeneration of mankind, and the promotion, in every possible shape and manner, of the true interests of the world. Thus, it will appear, that the true Christian is the 'salt of the earth.' He lives 'in the world'—there is no perceptible difference between him and his neighbours—yet, he is not 'of the world,' being influenced by views and opinions, hopes and fears, totally different from those of the rest of mankind.

"I might proceed here to open up greater mysteries still, but I spare you. I might address you on the subject of the 'real presence,' which the Christian enjoys in the eucharist—of that eating and drinking of the very body and blood of Christ, which are the Christian's alone; but I should know more of the mind of the person whom I speak to, before I would bring before him the deep things of God. I will pass such subjects over here. They are that very 'secret,' the 'discipline' of which has been so much talked about in your church; which your brethren, reverend sir, imagine themselves to be skilled in; but of which, in point of fact, they know nothing at all. I will not go further, then, as to the peculiarities of the faith of our holy church; but proceed at once to the other part of the subject—that is, to dwell for a

while upon the *results* which must need flow from the doctrine of justification as it is held among you.

"You cannot have avoided perceiving, from the statement already made, that the consequence which mainly flows from the doctrine of 'justification by faith alone,' (and I trust, that in considering the subject, you will sink the paltry cavils which little-minded people would indulge in, and consider it with that candour and fairness which the tone of your letter would lead me to hope from you)—I say you must have seen, that the main consequence which flows from our doctrine, is liberty—enlightened liberty—a liberty which is safely granted, because it originates from a principle that prevents its abuse—the glorious liberty of the children of God.' It is the prevalence of this principle which makes constitutional liberty safe. Men may, in a state of society, be permitted to enjoy freedom, when their principles are such as to render it certain that that freedom will only be used for the benefit of society itself. Pray, then, observe attentively this important consequence of our doctrine. And let me now, with the utmost sincerity, proceed to tell you the view that I take of the consequences of that doctrine of justification which holds among you.

"You teach, then, that in order to justification, the person feelingly convinced of his sin, must look for pardon through faith and obedience; otherwise, through faith and works combined; and that every fresh conviction of sin, is to be got rid of and put away by renewed obedience. You carefully instruct the people, that it is a downright heresy to think faith in Christ alone sufficient for peace; and that it rather marks presumption than a sound state of mind. The doctors of Louvain thus put the view of your church in the ninth of those articles, which, at the time of the Reformation, they published against Martin Luther. 'That faith, whereby one firmly believes and is convinced for certain that his sins have been pardoned, and that he will possess eternal life, has no testimony in Scripture; nay, it is opposed thereunto. Although we ought with a firm and certain hope to expect, through the sacrament of baptism and penance in this life, the remission of sins, and, in the world to come, eternal life.' And Dr. Milner, speaking of your church, says, that 'she asserts that we have free will; and that this, being prevented by divine grace, can, and must, co-operate to our justification *by faith, sorrow for sin, and other corresponding acts of virtue.*' (See *End of Controversy*, Part II., Letter xix., page 46.) Mark here, justification is described as arising from a combination of faith and works. I attach no weight to these authorities, any further than so far as they express the mind of your church, which I think you will admit they do, at least in this particular. I take it then for granted, that this is a true statement of your opinion on the point. You teach the person convinced of sin to look for pardon through faith and works combined, and that his painful convictions are to be put away and kept off by constantly renewed obedience; that, in fact, heaven is to be won by him through the constant maintenance of a holy and religious life.

“Now, I contend for it, that this view of the Christian religion never can produce peace of conscience. Just in proportion as the soul has been feelingly quickened to a sense of its corruptions, will be the dissatisfaction connected with all its performances. There will be a constant sense, in this case, of its short-comings. Its wanderings in prayer, during sacraments and all other holy services, will incessantly embitter its peace and heighten its fears. The obtrusiveness of unholy imaginations, of natural appetites, of impure desires, of worldly inclinations, will never cease to alarm the conscience, and compel the sinner to experience a painful sense of all the insurmountable difficulties that he has to accomplish for the salvation of his soul. Just in proportion as his sensibility on these subject is quickened, will his tranquillity be disturbed and his confidence weakened, or rather, indeed, entirely destroyed. He can have no confidence in the favour of God, who feels that that confidence is to be purchased by his obedience; and that, at the same time, he is constantly provoking God by wicked thoughts or works. The necessary result of your doctrine must be this, that just in the same proportion as an individual becomes concerned about salvation, will he be brought under a feeling of the urgent necessity of paying that full measure of obedience for it which he knows that it will cost. Hence, lengthened vigils, painful fasts, unintermitted mortifications—consisting of self-inflicted scourgings, beds of thorns, and shirts of hair; the greatest possible seclusion from the world, its cares, trials, and temptations, will constitute that fund of merit through which so much is to be expected; and it will follow, that the more perfect any individual becomes, the more entirely will he bind himself under stringent obligations, to lay up for himself a fund of merit that shall secure his salvation. In effect, the more unreservedly he brings himself into bondage, the stronger, according to your principle, will be the ground of his hope. This is naturally and necessarily the result of making law—or the fulfilment of law, in however slight a degree, a part of the cause of a sinner's justification with God. Hence, the apostle Paul, when glorying in the peculiarities of the Gospel, triumphantly exclaims, (Rom. viii. 15,) ‘Ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.’ Nor is there one single thing which he is so emphatic on as he is on the ‘liberty’ of the Gospel, as contrasted with the ‘bondage’ generated by the law. You will perceive, then, that the spirit which *your* doctrine of justification produces, is ‘the spirit of bondage;’ and that it is utterly at variance with, and opposed to, Gospel liberty, and the spirit of the Gospel. I would put it to your candour to say, whether these views do not receive the most striking illustration in that state of things which exists in your church. What is called amongst you ‘the doctrine of perfection,’ is the greatest possible amount of ‘bondage;’ the most perfect amongst you are those who are the most secluded from the world, the most remarkable for voluntary inflictions, the most ‘bound,’ in fact, those most under the influence of ‘the spirit of bondage.’

"Hence, I conclude that your doctrine of justification, producing effects so contrary to those of the true Gospel, is a false doctrine; and if a false doctrine, since it is an essential one, most certainly anti-christian in its character. Now, I ask, is it at all to be wondered at, that a church which teaches a fundamental doctrine false and anti-christian, should be left utterly destitute of divine light, and given up in all its operations to kindred delusions? I deeply deplore the necessity which compels me to employ language so painful. I am thus plain, not that I may offend, but that I may, if possible, reclaim.

"Now mark, I entreat you, some of those kindred delusions which I have referred to.

"The perfect among you are driven by a pressing sense of the exigencies of the case, to struggle for their salvation, by the performance of an endless round of duties. But you teach that this is not necessary for *all*. It follows, then, that the differences between the performances of those who get to heaven without submitting themselves to 'the rule of perfection,' and of those who do, are, in fact, performances of supererogation. Hence the Pope's treasury of good works—hence indulgences, &c., &c.

"But again, works are a ground of justification; sufferings, the material of merit. Hence, nothing can be so natural as that there should be a department in another world where additional sufferings may be endured, and thus additional merit brought into existence. Hence, purgatory. We, who utterly deny any meritorious efficacy in works or in sufferings; who deny that any individual can do anything to merit his own salvation, or endure anything that could satisfy for the least of his sins, are compelled, of course, to deny both work of supererogation and a purgatory.

"But again, to those who do not regard the salvation of men as completed by the sacrifice of Calvary, how gratifying it must be to contemplate a daily renewal of that great work! Transubstantiation, and the sacrifice of the mass, must be to them, indeed, eminently pleasing; on the contrary, those who know that their sins are pardoned by the offering up of Christ 'once for all,' need no repetition of the work, feeling that 'by one offering they that are sanctified are for ever perfected.' (Heb. x. 14.)

"In fine, denying, as we do, any saving efficacy in creature works, and experiencing an all-sufficiency in Christ our Saviour, in his finished atonement and mediatorial work or intercession, we necessarily put away from us, as futile, any dependency on inferior things.

"To admit, then, for a moment, into the doctrine of justification, the propriety of ever so small a dependency upon the creature, would be to open the door to every species of delusion and error.

"Thus would I deduce from an essential and fundamental difference in the most important of the articles of the Christian faith, all the less important discrepancies between the churches, and lead to the awful but unquestionable conclusion, that if *one* conduct its followers

to happiness, the *other* must plunge them into perdition. To suppose that a community should be allowed to grow up in the world, and bear the name of Christian, which would be productive of evils so destructive in their consequences, without due warning given in the Scriptures of truth, would be something like an impeachment of the justice of the divine Majesty. However, for such impeachment there is no place. In the peculiarities of your church we find nothing to excite our surprise—nothing which does not, through the divine Wisdom, tend to confirm us in the faith of our own apostolical body. But I must say no more. There are mysteries at the foundation of both our systems; and as I had certain reasons for withholding a statement of that great mystery which we are connected with, so have I others different, but not less cogent, for allowing yours to remain on this occasion, *sub silentio*. I think I have said sufficient to afford you grounds from which to perceive that the union which you expressed a hope for, is one that never can be realized.

“I cannot conclude this epistle,—which, compared with the space in which I hoped to dispose of the subject, is certainly a long one, although short in comparison with its importance—without repeating a former remark. As the preaching of the true doctrine brings those who effectually receive it into the enjoyment of a sanctified liberty, so does it, from its merely humanising influence, through the magnificent display which it makes of the attributes of God, of the wretched and miserable state of ruin, irrecoverable by himself, into which man has been plunged by the fall; work upon society, through the divine blessing, such a beneficial influence as to make it capable of a liberty in some degree analogous to that which true believers partake of by faith. Whereas, on the other hand, the preaching of the doctrine of human merit, and its efficacy for salvation, and of the want of complete sufficiency in the one sacrifice of Christ ‘once offered,’ and in his mediation for all the purposes of our redemption, while it brings those affected with zeal and piety under the iron bondage of a system of legality, does, at the same time, lead the mass of mankind into such entirely erroneous notions; both with respect to their own character and to that of him with whom they have to do, and does so bury them in the profundities of a spiritual darkness, that, divested of truth and deceived by error, they continue the slaves of those domineering lusts, and passions, and perversities, which they have inherited from their first parent; so that they can only exist in society when they are crushed by the iron hand of temporal despotism, and compelled to endure a bondage in society imposed by others, as galling as that which those who are the devotees of their system voluntarily inflict upon themselves.

“I trust, reverend sir, that you may give a fair consideration to these views; and if you do, I am quite sure that you will agree with the best men of both parties, that any union between such irreconcilable opposites as the Church of England and the Church of Rome, must be utterly impossible.

"You will, without doubt, have gathered from the above, that Tractarianism is *essential Popery*. If it were let alone, it would soon be as identical with Popery in form as it is in essence. It is very remarkable, that the great Luther rarely attacked anything in Popery but its 'Tractarianism.' His discerning mind saw with a glance, that all the corruptions of the system which he attacked sprang from an adulterated doctrine of justification. Hence his apothegm, that the doctrine of justification by faith alone, was the *articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ*. This doctrine is as great an abhorrence to the Tractarians, as it can be to you."

In this letter of mine it was my sole object, as my readers will perceive, to disprove the first resolution promulgated by the priest, and to show in opposition to that resolution, that there was an utter irreconcilability between the Church of Rome and that of England. My letter was transmitted to the priest, and he noticed it in a succeeding number of the magazine in such a way as showed that he misapprehended my purpose—that he thought my object was to disprove the Romish, and to prove the Anglican doctrine of justification. Had such been my intention, it would have been very badly executed indeed; but it was not.

The following is the priest's reply, extracted from the *Dublin University Magazine* :—

"The subject of justification is much spoken of by some of my correspondents, by one of them particularly, and the same no trifling theologian, as far as I am a judge. He lays down fairly enough the Protestant and Roman Catholic doctrines on this subject: the Protestant doctrine,—that faith alone is sufficient for justification; the Catholic, that good works with faith are necessary. He produces the various texts by which the doctrine of each is supported, and concludes, after much plausible reasoning, in favour of justification by faith alone. Yet, I cannot reconcile with the doctrine that faith alone is sufficient, the words of St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans:—'For not the hearers of the law are just before God: but the *doers of the law* shall be justified.' (Rom. ii. 13.) And the words of Christ to the young man, 'But if thou wilt enter into life, *keep the commandments*.' (Matt. xix. 17.) Nor can I reconcile with it the words of St. Paul exhorting us to '*work out* our salvation with fear and trembling;' (Phillip. ii. 12;) nor the admonition of Peter (2 Peter i. 10,) 'Wherefore, brethren, labour the more, that by good works you may make sure your calling and election.' Neither, if the doctrine of our dissenting brethren as to justification be true, am I able to understand how to us can apply the parable in which it is mentioned that the servant who traded with his five talents was rewarded, and the idle servant who hid the one he had received was cast away. (Matt. xxv. 14, 15, 16, &c.) Besides, would it not seem more reasonable that justification, and salvation which follows it, should be the rewards of our own efforts, inspired and assisted by the grace of God, than that the one and the other should be, I might say, entirely independent of us? Would there not appear a good deal of justness in the saying of St. Augustine, 'God, who made us without our help, will not save us without our co-operation?' If a man wishes to become rich, must it not be through his own industry; if learned, by firm and continued application? And is justification, and the crown which rewards it, less worth contending for than riches and learning? 'And they indeed,' says St. Paul, 'that they may receive a corruptible crown; but we an incorruptible one.' (1 Cor. ix. 25.) Does it not strike one that the doctrine which attributes justification to faith alone must lead, if not to

loose morality, at least to culpable inactivity and neglect?*" But to use a phrase of my respected correspondent, it would be 'tedious and vulgar' to adduce all the arguments, which every body knows [?], on this subject. I only wish to explain; I only wish to be enlightened; I am open to conviction. If any man shall give me fair and convincing proofs for the Protestant doctrine on the subjects of justification and the eucharist—for, after all, these are the two great points at issue between us—if any man, I say, place before me fair and convincing arguments on these points, such as will move a candid and unprejudiced mind, before three months I shall become a minister of the Established Church, if I shall be received as such; and this I will do without any regard to friends or connexions, ancient prejudices or public contempt. And why do I make this pledge? For this reason simply, that it is my conviction alone of the soundness of her doctrines which binds me to the Catholic Church. I have nothing to gain, but much to suffer, by my adhesion to that church; she has no temporal blessings to bestow; there is much that is most severe, I shall not say insupportable, in her discipline. Her ministers, though men, are called upon to lead in this world the lives of angels; and their salvation is, therefore, perilled, if not entirely and hopelessly forfeited. What motive, then, can I have in adhering to that church, but my belief in the orthodoxy of her doctrines? Those things which I and many complain of, she can, I believe, rectify; and when she will, then shall she go forth and conquer."

To these observations I replied by a letter as follows:—

"You are quite right. The great points at issue between us are the doctrines of justification and of the eucharist. I am glad you do not, like too many, confound the detail of our differences with these grand fundamentals. Indeed, I am sure you will agree with what I stated in my former letter, that even of these two points the latter is involved in the former; and that a correct view of the doctrine of justification will imply the Protestant doctrine on the eucharist; so that the subject of inquiry will be very much narrowed. You say that you are open to conviction on these points. I thank God for it; and I heartily, and in the language of the apostle, pray that God who commandeth the light to shine out of darkness, may shine into our hearts, to give us both the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.

"You state, I repeat, that you are open to conviction. Well, I venture to say, that, with the help of God, I shall supply you with arguments sufficient to convince the reason. I humbly trust that they may produce that effect. But mere conviction of the reason on such a subject is not sufficient. A man, as a Protestant, may be convinced in his *reason* that justification is by faith alone, and yet the principle be but a dogma in his mind. So long as it is only so, though it may keep him in the right path, it will be to a great degree, if not entirely, as far as his own interest in it is concerned, inoperative and uninfluential. It is when, under a sense of utter ruin, by nature and by practice; of insufficiency to think, act, or do wisely, righteously, or holily, to contribute in the slightest possible degree to your justification before God; you shall have prostrated yourself before the divine Majesty, and confessed an utter abandonment of all

* "In saying that God expects our co-operation, we Catholics do not detract from the merits of Christ; for we believe that of ourselves we can do nothing, and that it is through the blood and merits of Christ only that we can be justified and saved."

hope but from the all-sufficiency and sole-sufficiency of Jesus Christ, and of him alone, to the utter rejection of all dependency on the creature, whether on yourself or on others, whether they be saints or angels, principalities or powers; and it is when you shall have derived from such act of faith, a supernatural and astonishing testimony, sent down from heaven, of the divine favour bestowed upon you for Christ's sake, and of the complete and entire pardon of all your sins, and an assurance that neither life nor death, nor things present nor things to come, shall be able to separate you from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord; it is then that you will be brought to see the blackness of the darkness of Popery (pardon the use of the term), and to confess that that system constitutes nothing more or less than a total nullification and abrogation of the Gospel. You will then be able to say, not I am to be justified by faith in Christ; but thus, *I am actually*—even *I myself, now* justified and pardoned, filled with joy and peace, with power, and strength, and wisdom—yea, even with the Holy Ghost himself—lifted above the world, and supplied with power to overcome it; yea, even made to sit with Christ in heavenly places. This is the sort of 'conviction' on the subject that the true Christian will not cease till he has attained unto; and short of which, however much his *reason* may be convinced, he is absolutely dead in trespasses and sins. Believe me, sir, that I speak of the things which we have 'handled of the word of life.' I have told you the story of all true Protestant Christians. It may lead you to entertain a correct idea of the nature of the power which in Protestantism has encountered your system and narrowed its influence; and when I add that too many of our people, alas! rest content with the admission of the correctness of our doctrine, as a matter of opinion, without ever pressing forward to the attainment of its true spiritual efficacy, I shall have stated to you the cause of our present weakness, our shame, and our overthrow. That I may not, however, dwell any longer in mere introductory observation, I will come more closely to that part of your last published letter intended for me.

"I fear I have not made myself sufficiently understood. You say that I produced the various texts by which our several doctrines were supported; and that I 'concluded, after much plausible reasoning, in favour of justification by faith alone.' Pardon me for saying, that this is not an accurate statement of the fact. I say this, not, believe me, to reproach you. I did not make myself plain enough, I suppose. It was *not* the object of my letter to you to 'prove' *our* doctrine of justification, nor yet to disprove *yours*. I did not make use of any 'reasoning' with this view. My simple object was—taking for *granted* the difference between the churches on this fundamental point—to show that it constituted an impassable barrier to any reconciliation between them; that it overthrew your first proposition, viz., that as we agreed in fundamentals, we might easily enough be expected to amalgamate. The reasoning which I employed was devoted simply to

a development of the respective *results* of our opposite principles, to a demonstration that from your doctrine of justification necessarily spring the peculiarities of your system, while the amazingly different peculiarities of Protestantism spring from ours. It struck me that by this process, more clearly than in any other way, the utter irreconcilability of our principles would be apparent; that thus your first proposition would fall to the ground, and with it your proposed 'reconciliation.' Upon considering over the matter, I am sure you will perceive that *this* was my object. Since I believed that your proposal was utterly impracticable, it was the only object that I was *then* called upon to aim at. As, however, your last letter challenges something like the proof of our principle, I shall with the utmost pleasure, so far as a letter of moderate length can do, supply you with it, or at least with such considerations on the subject as I think likely to lead to the conviction which I would be so desirous of creating in your mind; for, believe me, that the proof is only to be found in an incessant reading of the Word of God and of your own heart. Let me, however, first betake myself to those texts which you say you cannot reconcile with our views.

"1. 'Not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the *doers of the law* shall be justified.' (Rom. ii. 13.) Certainly, so say we also. But then '*none*' are '*doers of the law*;' and this it was the very object of the apostle in this place to show, as you will perceive by reading the whole context. Hence he winds up his argument in chap. iii. 9, and following verses, saying, 'both Jews and Gentiles, they are all under sin: . . . there is *none* righteous, no, not one, &c. . . what things the law saith, it saith.' Why? with what view? To produce justification? to enable men to plead obedience as a ground of their acceptance? No; but to show the *impossibility* of obedience, and to produce confusion of face at the consideration of it; 'what things the law saith it saith, that *every mouth may be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God*;' therefore, (says he,) 'by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight.' Why? answer—for by the law is the knowledge of sin.' The law serves no other end, as to its effective power, but to show us our utter inability to please God; in order that, seeing our ruin by nature, we may come to be justified by faith. Read Galatians iii.; especially consider verse 24.

"2. 'If thou wilt enter into life, *keep the commandments*.' (Matt. xix. 17.) Admirable wisdom! Just such would be the answer that a well-instructed Gospel minister, holding our doctrine, who could discern the Spirit, should give to such a person. Our Lord sent this man to the 'schoolmaster'—the law,—that he might discover his wretchedness, and cry, with those in another place, 'Lord, I have endeavoured to keep the commandments, but failed in all my endeavours. The spirituality of the law has revealed to me my misery—

tell me how shall I obtain righteousness? 'How shall I work the works of God?' The answer would be the same as that given in John vi. 29. In effect, we consider that the whole context shows that our Lord gave the precept you have quoted, not as supposing that the young man could keep it, but 'that his mouth might be stopped,' and he be brought to feel himself 'guilty before God.' When it *did not* produce the effect, by heightening the claims of the law, which demands an entire surrender of all God's glory, the sinner was detected and exposed at least, if not reclaimed; perhaps, indeed, ultimately led to seek for salvation through faith. You will understand me.

"3. (I will give the context.) 'Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling. For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure.' (Phil. i. 12.) The object of this exhortation can only be misapprehended by overlooking the character of those to whom it is addressed. They were already justified. 'I am confident,' says St. Paul, (1. 6,) 'that he which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ.' The Spirit of God had 'begun,' and 'he,' not *they*, were to continue it. However, I would say on your passage—first, the emphasis on the expression '*your own* salvation,' is derived from a consideration of the apostle's 'absence' on the occasion referred to; so that it is as if he said, 'Now, in my absence, you are left to yourselves; you no longer have me as a counsellor and an auxiliary in the work of your salvation, which has already effectually begun by a simple faith in Christ Jesus; instead, then, of working along with me, as you before did, work out your salvation now by yourselves; go on alone with that, in the doing of which I was formerly your helper.' But secondly, the true emphasis of the passage lies on the words, '*with fear and trembling*;' as if he said, 'Go on with the work of your salvation with *fear and trembling*, because ye can do absolutely nothing of yourselves; it is "God who worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure."' I think that if you consider the whole passage with candour, you will perceive that it makes as strongly for the view which I insist upon as any passage can. I would remark in general, with respect to all such, (and they are very numerous,) that they do not necessarily imply that there is *any*, the very smallest, native energy in men, which would render the passages suitable. The quickening energy is in the 'word,' through the good Spirit of God, and not in the subject to whom the word is addressed. It is written, 'Strive to enter in at the strait gate,' 'Run the race that is set before you,' 'Be kindly affectioned one towards another,' &c.; and yet none of these texts imply that there was a native strength to fulfil them in those to whom they were addressed. Christ said to the dead man, 'Lazarus, come forth;' to the leper, 'Be thou clean;' to Jairus's daughter, 'Maiden, arise;' and *the word spoken* in these cases produced the effects intended, without the smallest power in the

individuals to 'co-operate' with that word ; the word rather subdued them than was received by them. We are by nature as to spiritual things as dead, and deaf, and blind, and dumb, as were those physically on whom these miracles were wrought. When, however, we have been quickened to spiritual life, and light, and liberty, by the operation of saving faith, we are addressed in the language of exhortation ; not that we have power of *ourselves* to think or do anything as of ourselves, but because there is a sufficiency which is totally independent of us, vouchsafed unto us by God. (2 Cor. iii. 5.)

" 4. 'Wherefore, brethren, labour the more, that by good works you may make sure your calling and election.' (2 Peter i. 10.) I perceive that this is the translation of the Vulgate. I do not know by what authority the words 'by good works' are inserted, for they are not in either of the Greek versions which I have. However, a very slight consideration of the passage will show you that it does not make against the Protestant doctrine, even supposing these words to be unobjectionable. It is evident that our 'calling and election' are of God. He 'calls' and he 'elects;' so that the whole sense of the passage would be this, 'Let your works be such as that they shall be an evidence both to yourselves and others, that you have been surely called and elected of the Lord.' In effect, the same principle of explanation which I suggested under the last head, applies to this passage also.

" 5. With respect to the parable of the talents, (Matt. xxv..) I would beg to say, that I think it illustrates a subject quite different from that which occupies our attention at present. Allow me to lay before you two of the articles of the holy Irish Catholic church :—'XI. We are accounted righteous before God, *only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, by faith, and not *for our own works and deservings*. Wherefore that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort,' &c. That is to say, the talents were 'given'—five, and two, and one: the servants did not give one single farthing for any of their portions :—'XII. Good works, which are the fruits of faith, and which follow *after justification*, are pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith;' insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit.' The *profits* of the servants were these 'fruits of a lively faith;' from it, and not from a native free will towards what was good, they sprung. I suppose that the unprofitable servant pictures out the man who receives the doctrines of truth, holds them as *opinions*, glories in them as *dogmas*, but never applies them to the salvation of his soul. Upon the whole I think you will admit, that in order to illustrate your position, the parable should state that the master received some consideration, however small, from each of the servants for the talents that he conferred upon them; whereas it states, in fact, that these portions were in every case a 'free gift.'

“These are the remarks that I would make upon your texts—brief, I admit, and unelaborate. They will show you that we *can* reconcile them with our views in such a way as to be satisfactory to ourselves. We conceive that such explanations are in accordance with the whole spirit of the Scriptures and the stupendous system of evangelical truth. They are the explanations suggested to us also by the mind of the Holy Catholic church which speaks in Ireland. The Catholic church which speaks in Rome, interprets them differently; but, as if conscious of the erroneousness of her views, she dreads the free investigation of the Scriptures by her people. It is for you to consider whether of the two churches speaks against the mind of Christ. Whichever does so is a church *opposed to Christ*: of that there can be no doubt at all. I trust, reverend sir, that you will accept what I say with your wonted candour.

“You proceed in these words—‘It would seem more reasonable that justification, and salvation, which follows it, should be the rewards of our own efforts, inspired and assisted by the grace of God, than that the one and the other should be, I might say, entirely independent of us. Would there not appear a good deal of justness in the saying of St. Augustine—“God, who made us without our help, will not save us without our co-operation?” If a man wishes to become rich, must it not be through his own industry?—if learned, by firm and continued application? And is justification, and the crown which rewards it, less worth contending for than riches and learning? ‘And they indeed,’ says St. Paul, ‘that they may receive a corruptible crown, but we an incorruptible one.’ (1 Cor. ix. 25.) Does it not strike one that the doctrine which attributes justification to faith alone must lead, if not to loose morality, at least to culpable inactivity and neglect?’ I am sure that you have here spoken with a great deal of sincerity, and I will further admit, as you will see by-and-by, with much of what the world fully admits to be wisdom; nevertheless, if I do not quite miscalculate, you yourself will concede in a short time, that what you say is unsound every whit. I would, however, in the first place, commence with the latter part of the subject here proposed by you.

“You apprehend that we should fall into inactivity, if we had not to bring forth good fruits as the price of, or at least, as part-payment for, our salvation: that is to say, unless the *motive* of our good works was, to win heaven by them. Now, can you not conceive *another* motive, equally urgent as that laid down by you, to wit, the motive of gratitude for salvation *already received*—of love for Him who hath *freely* bestowed it on us? Can you not *conceive* this? I am sure you can. *This*, then, is the Protestant motive. I appeal to the history of the two churches, as to whether it is a less influential one than that which you contend for. Are not the holy angels diligent?—are not just men made perfect diligent? Yea, verily, to their diligence there is neither stop nor stay. The very same motive, then, which influences them, influences us—the principle of love towards God operating on our hearts by the gift of the Spirit of God. Now, remember, that we con-

stantly say to our people—'Work, strive, agonise,' 'Present your bodies a living sacrifice;' but remember that this will not be in any degree, however small, the price of your salvation. Work! because ye *are* the redeemed of the Lord. Glorify him, 'both in your bodies and in your spirits, which are his; because ye are not your own, but bought with a price.'

"Believe me, sir, that you greatly mistake, if you suppose that there is not a constraining influence in this motive infinitely greater than there is in that which you would seem at present to approve of. Read the Epistles of St. Paul, and you will uniformly find that it is after he has showed the church *that* it is saved, and *how* it is saved, that he flows out into those exhortations to practical godliness which he is so remarkable for. I trust that you will perceive, then, that our system need not engender that 'inactivity,' much less that 'loose morality,' which you seem to be apprehensive of from it.

"But I said you would get credit for wisdom in your remarks. I mean in those of them where you say, 'that it seems more *reasonable* that justification and salvation, which follows it, should be the reward of our own efforts, inspired and assisted by the grace of God, than that they should be independent of us; and, that as riches and learning, and so on, are the fruits of our industry, so should a crown of glory be.' Yes; I am quite sure this is the 'common sense' of the thing. This is what 'human reason' and 'human wisdom'—the wisdom of 'the schools,' and, I may add, the wisdom of the schoolboys—would suggest on the subject. The truth is, men bring the reasonable adage of 'a fair day's wages for a fair day's work' into the affairs of heaven, and argue naturally enough that a man must 'earn' the rewards of heaven as he does those of earth. But what is the fact? Why, the fact is, that ordinary, corrupt, 'common sense,' is utterly *opposed* to 'scriptural sense;' and that the 'wisdom' of *the world*, and the 'reason' of *the world*, are nothing more than sheer folly when exercised on the things of God. We do not object to transubstantiation so much because it is at variance with common sense, as because it is opposed to Scripture and subverts the true doctrine of the Gospel. I repeat, then, that scriptural doctrine is opposed to the wisdom of the world; and this the apostles all labour to prove. If I may be allowed a remark in passing, it is the forgetfulness of this which is the curse of the Church of Rome. Take a few instances.

"Arguing for the intercession of the Virgin Mary, you say, 'Is it not 'common sense' to go first to a man's mother if you want a favour from himself?' This seems plausible; but look a little more deeply, and the truth is, it is false. Perhaps it is not in one case in a hundred that you would further your interest by going 'first to a man's mother;' and you would never do so, if the man told you *that* he would regard it as an impertinence to do so, or had expressly commanded that the appeal should be made boldly to himself. (See Heb. iv. 16, and two preceding verses.)

"Again, contending for due veneration for images, you say, 'Would

we not venerate the image of a father, of a mother, or of a dear friend? Why not, then, the image of Christ and of the saints? Now, suppose a man came into my house, put into my hands a picture, and told me it was that of my father; and that I began with a morbid sensibility to fondle it, and kiss it, &c., &c., thinking it was the image of my father, when all the while it was that of Thomas Paine, or some such abhorred character; how foolish I should look! Does he look less contemptible in the sight of God and angels, who is melting in tenderness over the effigies of Judas, or some ungodly prostitute which the devil, perhaps, has inspired some painter to draw, while he fancies himself gazing upon Christ or the Virgin. Pray endeavour to realize the contempt with which the spiritual intelligences must regard so gross an adulation. Excuse these thoughts; I might say much in the same strain, but revert to the subject in hand.

“What, then, does the apostle tell us with respect to the true doctrine of the Gospel? He says of it, ‘The preaching of the cross is to them that perish, *foolishness*, but unto us which are saved it is the power of God. For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent.’ Has not God made *foolish* the wisdom of this world? ‘It pleased God, by the *foolishness* of preaching to save them that believe. We preach Christ crucified, unto the Greeks *foolishness*, but unto them which are saved, the power of God, and the wisdom of God. Who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.’ (1 Cor. i. 18.) &c. Again, ‘The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are *foolishness* unto him.’ (ii. 14.) Again, ‘The wisdom of this world is *foolishness* with God.’ (iii. 11.) I grant that it seems amazingly foolish, quite opposed to ‘common sense’ and the ‘world’s wisdom,’ to say that justification is absolutely, altogether, and entirely free. Nay, it seems likely to deluge the world with licentiousness; and yet the very reverse is the case. This doctrine has been the source of holiness, righteousness, liberty, and enlightenment to the nations. It seems wise to tell men, ‘In order to get to heaven, you must seek it as the reward of your works;’ yet this seemingly ‘wise’ doctrine, absolutely, in past times, obliterated the Gospel, and steeped the nations in demoralisation, slavery, and death. *How?* I shall show you in the sequel. I would desire, however, at present to refer you to one other passage from St. Paul. He is speaking in Rom. ix. 30, of the cause on account of which the Gentiles made a greater progress in the Gospel than the Jews; and he uses this remarkable language—‘The Gentiles *which followed not* after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith. But Israel, *which followed after the law* of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness. Wherefore? Because they sought it not of faith, but as it were by the works of the law. For they stumbled at that stumbling-stone.’ The sense of all which is this, that because the Jews sought justification by works, they

did not find it; whereas, the Gentiles, who looked simply for justification by faith, obtained the blessing. The same point is put, if possible, more strongly in the third verse of the next chapter, where he says—‘They being ignorant of God’s righteousness’ (that is to say, of the supernatural righteousness of which I speak.) ‘and going about to establish their own righteousness’ (namely, by their works), ‘have not submitted themselves to the righteousness of God; for Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one who believeth.’ The words, ‘submitted themselves’ (as it were passively) ‘to the righteousness of God,’ are very remarkable. Observe: the apostle admits that there is a difficulty in the matter. He here calls the true doctrine a ‘stumbling-stone,’ as in the other case he designates it ‘foolishness;’ indicating by both terms, that it would be a thing calculated to shock the ‘common sense’ and the natural ‘wisdom of the world.’ Do not, therefore, reverend sir, I beseech you, allow yourself to be prejudiced in favour of your view because it is identically conformed to the *quid pro quo* sense of the world, nor offended with ours because it sets at nought human powers, and represents men as absolutely ‘dead in trespasses and sins.’ Remember the divine oracle—‘The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.’ Now, if eternal life be the ‘gift of God,’ then is there nothing given for it—not a fraction of a particle of good works, else it were the purchase of these works, and it were an abuse of terms to call it a ‘gift.’

“But while our doctrine is considered ‘foolishness’ by men, is it ‘foolishness’ in fact? God forbid. No, it is ‘wiser than men.’ (1 Cor. i. 25.) It is ‘the things of the Spirit of God.’ (ii. 14.) It is ‘the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world to our glory.’ (ii. 7.) Now this it will be my object, in the next place, to show you. It shall by my object to open up and develope that grand system of evangelical truth, of which this particular mystery of justification by faith alone is, if I may use the language, the great corner-stone, in order that you may see that the peculiar doctrine of your church is nothing less than a total abrogation of the whole Gospel.

“However, I really think that I should reserve this for another letter. Hitherto I have merely occupied myself in the endeavour to meet your objections. It shall be my business in my next, which I hope to send you in a few days, to lay before you the great mystery of godliness as it is held in the Holy Catholic Church.

“I cannot conclude this letter without thanking you for the courtesy of your references to myself. I heartily rejoice at the holy indignation with which you speak of the celibatical injunctions of your church. They are monstrous, hideous, tyrannous, detestable. They show clearly, in fact, that your church is the object of a dreadful prophecy. (See 1 Tim. iv. 8.) If they be oppressive to the priesthood, with what an insupportable burden must they crush to the earth the more susceptible portion of the human race, those who are generally induced to

take the veil before nature has given them to understand the character of the sacrifice which they will have made? Have you ever considered the text in the fourth verse of the Epistle of St. Jude? Have you ever been brought to think that the emotions which incline male celibates towards the veneration of female saints, and female celibates to the worship of males, and which are thought to be devotional feelings arising from the operation of the grace of God, may be, in fact, nothing more than the workings of quite a different principle unnaturally thwarted and confined? I imagine that that is the true application of the passage.

"Be you well assured that you never will obtain a dispensation such as you speak of, the natural operation of which would be to uproot the devotion that patron saints receive. You talk about a possibility of abandoning Rome; I trust that you will never do so, until you shall feel that it is as much your duty to destroy it as to leave it.

"I cannot say that I go along with the commentator who has followed you in the *University Magazine*. In my opinion your defence of the Creed of Pope Pius is a valid one, as to its *principle* at least. The additional articles in that creed, I have always regarded as a true collection of the principles which really abounded in the Church of Rome, long before the creed was positively expressed in words. Hence, the real objection to your church is, not that it has that creed *now*, but that it had entertained the traditions which the creed sets forth before it (the creed) was formed. Our churches would be perhaps as irreconcilable if that creed did *not* exist, as they are now that it does.

"Again, the true objection to your church is, not that it receives traditions, but that it receives *false* ones. Our church receives the Catholic traditions; but it admits none which are irreconcilable with Scripture, as we contend that those received by Rome are, and as I think perhaps my next letter may induce you to admit.

"I hope I may not be going beyond 'the four corners' of my own undertaking, when I venture to refer to your dilemma. You say, 'If the Church of Rome be in error, it is either in *essentials* or *non-essentials*. If in essentials then, Christ's promises to his Church have failed.' I must here decidedly say, *negatur*. No, in that case *the Church of Rome* and its dependencies 'have failed,' (see Rom. xi. 21, 22,) but not the Church Catholic: thank God, the Church of Ireland is orthodox. However, I must stop."

This was the end of my letter. In accordance with the promise which it contained, I subsequently addressed to the priest a note, accompanied with two sermons,* proving from the Scripture the doctrine of justification by faith. I received, however, no reply; and in the lapse of a few months, the priest, and his proposal, and the idea of the reconciliation of the churches, had passed away from the public mind.

* These two sermons will be found in my volume of Sermons on Evangelical Doctrine, under the titles, "Salvation" and "Justification."

CHAPTER II.

THE SYSTEM OF THE REV. R. J. M'GHEE.

From the correspondence in the preceding chapter, my readers will distinctly gather two things: first, that the fundamental difference between the Church of England and the Church of Rome lies in the doctrine of justification. The doctrine of the respective churches on this head is the seed which produces, on one hand, the fruits of Protestantism, and on the other, those of Popery. They will gather, secondly, how very clear the scriptural demonstration is which the Protestant doctrine admits of. Indeed, I may say for myself, that I feel it quite impossible to contrast the views which Roman Catholics take of texts of Scripture, when they bring those texts forward in favour of their peculiarities, with the Protestant views of the same texts, without experiencing a kind of wonder that men should be found whose minds are so crookedly constructed, as that they can rest content with the utterly superficial gloss with which the Roman Catholic Church almost uniformly dishonours the Scriptures.

We may readily admit, that, at first glance, those texts which the priest, in the pages of the *University Magazine*, advanced, as making in favour of the Roman Catholic doctrine, did indeed seem to do so; but when attentively considered in the light which their context throws upon them, how instantaneously does the truth become plain! in fact, it at once becomes palpable to reason, that the Protestant view is correct, and that which the Roman Catholic takes utterly unwarranted.

It is quite impossible to read St. Paul's Epistles attentively, without perceiving that the one great point he insists upon is, the doctrine of "justification by faith only;" and this doctrine so exactly meets the condition of fallen man, and elucidates the purpose of God with respect to him, that its importance becomes impressed in the most vivid way upon the mind; it derives a strong hold upon the understanding, from the power with which it operates upon the affections of our nature; it is, in truth, "the key of David," the principle which lets light into the soul, and which sheds a brilliant effulgence upon all the mysteries of revelation. Without this doctrine there is nothing but clouds and darkness in the Christian religion; yet, at the very same time, the doctrine, so prime, so paramount, so precious to the spiritual man, is mere foolishness to the world. Every true Christian knows that the Protestant doctrine of justification is emphatically the corner-stone of all doctrinal truth; he will magnify it, he will exalt it; and he knows, by a sort of intuition, that if there be any indifference to the truth in the mind of an individual, however near he may be to the kingdom of God, he has not, in fact, entered it at all. No doubt the principle is

often held as a mere dogma, or opinion, without operating any substantive effects either upon the life or character; but the Christian will draw a clear distinction between the letter acceptation of it and the spiritual reception of it by the soul; and he will be prepared to admit, that if it be not experimentally realized, however sound the profession may be, all will be hollow within. The doctrine will be, in such a case, ineffectual and inoperative: this will not, however, in the slightest degree, diminish his confidence in its paramount importance, nor lead him the less to insist upon its downright and absolute reality and weight.

Now here is a source of one error in carrying on the Roman Catholic controversy.

I admit, or rather I contend for, the necessity for resting upon this doctrine as the chief element of success in warring against the Roman Catholic system; but God Almighty has not commissioned us to contend for it as an abstraction. Paramount as the principle is, he has not left it to make its way alone and unassisted; he has hedged it round, and enveloped it on every side by a vast amount of correlative truth; and while he certainly commends the doctrine to us as the very chief in the controversy, he does not warrant us to neglect its circumstantialia. And here, as aforesaid, I think has been to a great extent one error in past times.

For example: I have known some distinguished controversialists who would reduce the controversy to a simple investigation of St. Paul's Epistles, or the first of them—the Epistle to the Romans. That Epistle would seem particularly fitted for the purpose; it was addressed to the Primitive Church of Rome; it was intended to prescribe the faith of that holy church: what portion of Scripture, then, so fit whereby to test the pretensions of the modern Church of Rome? It is full and explicit in the assertion of the doctrine of justification by faith only; it enlarges upon the spiritual results of that doctrine; it emphatically negatives the idea that good works constitute any portion of the meritorious cause of our justification; and therefore it has been conceived, that if a priest could be brought to the platform to attempt an exposition of the Epistle so as to justify his church, the unreasonableness of the attempt could be so developed by an enlightened opponent, as that it would cover with confusion the advocate of Popery. Now, I am strongly convinced in my own mind, that this might not be the case at all. Full well I know that the Protestant advocate would have truth on his side; and that the truth which he would promulgate would be richly appreciated by those who, like himself, were taught of God. He could bring from every part of Scripture, testimonies to support his views; and there is no manner of doubt but that he would be in the right. All his interpretations would be according to the *spirit* of the Scriptures; and to the spiritually-minded those interpretations would be quite satisfactory. But he would be encountered by plausible objections drawn from the *letter* of the Word. St. James would be made use of with the subtlety of the serpent. The legal

scriptures would be used in a manner that would nullify, or seem at least to nullify, the Protestant conclusion. Common sense would be appealed to, and the wisdom of man; and have we not the warrant of God's own declaration for saying, that in the light of these, or rather in their darkness, the wisdom of God would appear but foolishness? Let any one read Mr. Newman's *Sermons on Justification*; let him see the plausible refinements which, in those discourses, are employed to establish, in point of fact, the Roman doctrine, and then let him estimate the result on a popular assembly likely to be produced through counter expositions of the Epistle to the Romans by a Protestant divine on the one hand, and by an elegant Jesuit on the other—such a one as I think Mr. Newman, for example, would make—and I am much mistaken if he will not admit, that from such an encounter Protestantism could derive no great advantage.

Be it remembered, that the line which separates truth and error is, literally, a mathematical line—the trace of a point which has no parts. The very business of the sophist is, to approximate so nearly to the truth as that there shall be no interval seen between him and it. Now, this it is quite possible to do. He shall speak in such a way that you shall hear him, and listen to him, and ponder upon him, and you shall be compelled to acknowledge that you really can scarcely see any distance between him and truth; nor can you, at least, occasionally do so, though all the time he is on the other side of that line “which the eagle's eye hath not seen.”

I entreat of my discerning readers—of those who, while gifted with a divine knowledge of the great Gospel mystery, are at the same time furnished with accuracy of judgment—to weigh with themselves the following short extract from Mr. Newman's work on *Justification*, and when they have done so, to decide whether my observations as to the subtlety of error are not fully borne out. How refined must that spiritual discernment be which can not only apprehend the error that is here involved, but decide without hesitation that it is deadly in its nature; not only so, but that it differs in its results from truth as widely as does hell from heaven!—

The eleventh Article says we are justified by faith only, agreeable to which we are told in the homily on the Passion, that faith is the one mean and instrument of justification.

In the judgment, then, of this homily, faith is certainly in some distinct and important sense the sole mean and instrument of justification. The question is, in what sense?

Now, on the one hand, I observe, what all will allow, that the faith spoken of is not any faith, but a lively faith. This, indeed, is implied in the passage just quoted, which speaks as concerning “not an unconstant or wavering faith, but a sure, steadfast, grounded, and unfeigned faith.” Faith which does not trust, as the devil's faith—or faith which does not love, though it could “remove mountains”—or faith which cannot work, as his to whom “to will is present,” but “not to perform that which is good”—all such faith does not justify. It is, then, not mere faith, but faith under certain circumstances or conditions; faith, when it trusts, loves, and lives, a fruitful faith, which is the sole mean and instrument of justification.

On the other hand, I do not understand faith to be a general term, meaning

nothing more or less than trust, love, life, and all other excellencies of the new mind or creature together. When the homily calls it "the *sole mean*," it speaks by way of contrast to *other* graces. The writer would not call it the *sole mean* if it were the *sole grace*. By faith is not meant religiousness generally, nor obedience, nor spiritual life, nor love, nor hope, nor trust; whatever is meant, something is meant distinct from all these. I do not deny that faith often stands for these in Scripture, in the Homilies themselves, and elsewhere; nay, I will not deny that the homily before us, as being a popular discourse, does speak of faith as if it were something more than faith, viz., trust, confidence, hope, and perseverance, because it is really inseparable from them, and one with them; still, when it is called the sole instrument of justification, it must stand in contrast to them, as being one certain property, habit, or act of the mind. This is explicitly stated by another homily when it says, "that faith doth not shut out repentance, hope, love, dread, and the fear of God, to be joined with faith in every man that is justified; but it *shutteth them out from the office* of justifying."

Here I draw an important conclusion: that the instrumental power of faith cannot interfere with the instrumental power of baptism; because faith is the *sole justifier*, not in contrast to all means and agencies whatever (for it is not *surely* in contrast to our Lord's merits or God's mercy), but to all other *graces*. When, then, faith is called the "sole instrument," this means the sole *internal* instrument—not the *sole* instrument of any kind.

There would be nothing inconsistent, then, in faith being the sole instrument of justification, and yet baptism also the sole instrument, and that at the same time because in distinct senses—an inward instrument in no way interfering with an outward instrument. Baptism might be the hand of the giver, and faith the hand of the receiver; however, it is not so, as is plain, for this reason—that baptism occurs but once, whereas justification is a state, and faith "abides." Justification, then, needs a perpetual instrument, such as faith can, and baptism cannot, be. Each, then, has its own office in the work; baptism at the time when it is administered, and faith ever after. Faith secures to the soul continually those gifts which baptism primarily conveys. The sacraments are the immediate—faith is the secondary, subordinate, or representative instrument of justification; or, we may say, varying our mode of expression, that the sacraments are its instrumental, and faith its sustaining cause.

Faith, then, being the appointed representative of baptism, derives its authority and virtue from that which it represents. It is justifying because of baptism; it is the faith of the baptized, of the regenerate—that is, of the justified. Justifying faith does not precede justification; but justification precedes faith, and makes it justifying. And here lies the cardinal mistake of the views on the subject which are now in esteem. They make faith the sole instrument, not after baptism, but before it; whereas baptism is the primary instrument, and creates faith to be what it is, and otherwise is not—giving it power and rank, and as it were, constituting it its own successor.

That this is the doctrine of our church, appears from the Homilies. These are addressed, not to heathens, but to Christians—they are practical and popular exhortations to Christians. They inform a baptized congregation, or, as they speak, "dear Christians," "good Christian people," how they may be saved; not how God will deal with the heathen. They are not missionary discourses, directing pagans how to proceed in order to be justified, but are composed for the edification of those who, through God's mercy, are already "dearly beloved in Christ;" and as regards the points before us, they lay down "what the lively and true faith of a *Christian man* is." Clear, however, as this is at first sight, I will make some extracts from them to impress it upon the mind.—*Sermon on Justification by Faith only.*

Conceive an able disputant, armed with such a mind as that of Mr. Newman, encountering the advocate who had confined his attack on Popery to the single article of "justification by faith alone," in a temper as argumentative as these extracts would lead us to infer that

he had at his disposal, and meeting the declamation and the fervour with which the truth might be supported, by the declamation and the fervour which the undeniable neglect of the truth by its professors might seem to warrant and render plausible; and who will venture to suppose that the result would be a verdict for the truth? nay, who can suppose but that the jury would break up without any decision at all?

No doubt our weapons are "mighty, through God, to the pulling down of strongholds;" but what is the chief of those weapons? It is the Word of God—the whole Word, and not a part of it; this constitutes the "sword of the Spirit;" and if we, without divine warrant, break the hilt off this sword, and enter the contest presumptuously with an Epistle, or a Gospel, or a Prophecy, it is natural to expect that the result of our presumption may be disappointment.

I am amazingly uneasy lest I should be thought to be vain-glorious, or puffed up with a self-sufficient spirit. God knows I have no right to be so. From my heart and soul I avow that I regard myself, sincerely and candidly, as one of the most unworthy and undeserving of God's people: I protest I am every day more and more astonished at the horrid depths of vileness, depravity, and folly; of pride, vanity, and ignorance; of lust and passion that are connected with, as I believe, a singularly corrupt nature. I am thoroughly convinced that, were it not for the astonishing grace of God that has checked and surrounded, counteracted and subdued the awful attributes of my nature, I should really stand before the world as the victim of lawless and unruly passions. Truly I can sympathise with John Bradford, who exclaimed, when he saw a criminal conveyed to the gallows—"There, but for the grace of God, goes John Bradford!" Similar, under like circumstances, would be my avowal. I am certain that I have in myself, in lamentable abundance, the elements and the remains of pride and vanity. I discern this; here do I publicly and with sincere humiliation confess it; but then I thank God that he hath enabled me to realize the text, "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him?" I see when the remains of indwelling evil begin to work, and I trust that I am furnished with sufficient grace to resist them. I am aware that there is necessity for extreme caution in giving expression to such observations as I at present urge, in order to avoid being led by vain glory or by pride rather than by a zeal for truth and a desire to advance its cause. But I must not shrink from the performance of a duty which is capable of being misconstrued, because it admits of that capability. Conscientiously believing that it is not the evil principle which might be, perhaps, suspected, which I myself would be forward to suspect, and am on my guard against, but the good principle of a sincere desire for the truth which actuates me, I must and I will speak. Circumstances call loudly upon me so to do.

I laid down for the Roman Catholic controversy a principle, which I am certain is a sound one; but I renounce the claim to the praise of it: to God be the glory. From the combined teaching of his church,

of his Word, and his Spirit, I learnt it; and I will not submit to the temptation of the devil to avoid insisting upon the truth, because it may be attributed to a carnal self-love. If I recognise in myself the danger of the evil that I have pointed out, I am not weak enough, nor flatterer enough, to go about to say that the same principle of carnal self-love may not work in others. I see a distinct inclination to supercede both my labours and myself, to make light of the victory that God gave to his own cause in my person, and to render predominant those incomplete systems which that victory was calculated to set aside, and I will not suffer this—it is my duty not to do so. I do not care one straw for popularity; but when it comes as the gift of God, when it gives weight to the influence of a mere nobody—such as I am; and when I then find an attempt to deprive me of it, to set light by the gifts of God conferred upon me, and all that not merely to my own disparagement, but to the detriment of the great cause that I have at heart, I will speak out, and nothing shall let me. Never did I attempt to make light of the labours or the worth of others. Were the attempt made to glorify me at their expense, I trust I should have the grace to forbid it; and this being the feeling of my mind, I am but little disposed to acquiesce in a different line of conduct when attempted towards myself.

We are entering upon a state of things more likely than any which has perhaps hitherto existed, to render it essential that the assault should be made on Popery in a manner not only invincible, but decisive. The priests who will henceforward come forth from Maynooth, will be men, not merely of extensive reading, but of highly-cultivated powers of mind, practised to deliver in the most elegant and attractive form the refined subtleties of the Tractarians—men against whom declamation, however elegant, will tell with little or with no effect; indeed I am convinced they could make it rebound with interest upon those who might have recourse to it. In the prospect of such an altered condition of our opponents, it is our duty to weigh well the effects which any proposed method of proceeding may operate upon the church; and if it be of such a character as would be little likely to do good, and not incapable of doing harm, to conclude at once that it cannot be the mode provided by divine wisdom, and therefore such as would be accompanied with the divine blessing. Perfectly convinced, then, though I be, that the Epistle to the Romans is strongly confirmatory of Protestant principle, while it condemns that of Rome, I should be exceedingly sorry to compromise the cause of truth by pitting myself against an adversary for the exposition of that portion of God's Word, because I might feel convinced that the Protestant view of it was the correct one, and that that which Rome would advance must be distorted and unscriptural. I again call on the judicious reader, and I would more especially, in all affection, call upon the judicious clergyman, to ponder upon the ideas which I have expressed on this subject, and to decide for himself, without bias one way or the other, as to the discretion manifested in resting the dispute between

us and Rome upon an inquiry as to the sense of the Epistle to the Romans.

There is a point upon which the Rev. R. J. M'Ghee relies, and which he pressed on me previously to the Discussion, not merely by a published letter, but in several conversations on the subject—on which point I, at that time, expressed to him a very distinct opinion—one which I then felt to be sound, and in which subsequent experience has only confirmed me. Mr. M'Ghee asserts that the following article in the creed of Pope Pius IV. is false, viz.:—“*I receive the sacred Scriptures in that sense which our holy mother the church has held, and does hold.*” On this my reverend friend thus spoke in a letter to me, which he published in the *Evening Mail*, on the 10th of April, 1838. “I assert that the bishops and priests of the Church of Rome impose on our lay Roman Catholic fellow subjects, pretending that they must receive the Scriptures on the interpretation of the church, while those priests know in their hearts that this is false, and that they have no such interpretation to give the people.” (See *Discussion Correspondence*, p. iv.) I debated this point in a friendly conversation with Mr. M'Ghee very shortly after the appearance of his letter; and I cannot but think that the arguments which I urged were perfectly sound. I am prepared to admit that the Roman Catholic Church *has*, in one point of view, an interpretation of the Scriptures; although I was so anxious to avoid even the semblance of opposition between Protestants, that in the letter in which I replied to my friend I did not dissent from his doctrine.

In the conversations to which I have alluded, I assumed the position of a Roman Catholic advocate, replying to the objection on the subject of the creed supposed to be advanced by the Protestant, who might assert that the article in question was false.

“Sir,” says the supposed priest, “your objection is based upon a narrow view of the words of the creed. You confound the ideas implied by the several terms ‘sense,’ ‘interpretation,’ and ‘commentary.’ The article is this—‘I receive the sacred Scriptures in that sense which the church hath held, and does hold.’ Now, the *sense* that is here spoken of may be gathered by means manifold and various. The practices of the church mark her sense of the Scriptures; her ritual does so; all her creeds—the Apostles’, the Nicene, that of St. Athanasius, the very creed now before us—indicate the sense in which the holy church regards the Scriptures; in effect, there is not one single authoritative formulary of the church, in the construction of which we may not feel convinced that she has been regulated by the Word of God, written and unwritten—of course these agree together—and every such formulary, therefore, contributes to the production of a sound judgment as to the *sense* of our holy mother upon the sacred volume. Hence, when the creed of Pope Pius sends the pious Catholic to the church for the ‘sense’ of the Scriptures, she informs him that what he reads therein must be by him inter-

preted in such a manner as not to clash with that which, with her thousand tongues, she otherwise conveys to him; and the spirit of obedience which her faith engenders, the spirit of humility and love, operates so blessedly, that it reconciles those apparent discrepancies which an unbelieving view would originate in the first instance, and magnify subsequently into inconsistent opposites.

"Yes, sir, the church has an interpretation of the Scriptures. It is your ignorance alone which prevents you from discerning it; for I shrink from saying that it is obstinacy which leads to its denial. The truth is, you misapprehend the whole force of the article! It involves in a manner that is both beautiful, and, when understood, very clear, too, the great doctrine of the infallibility of the church, and the principle that it is the very Spirit which dictated the written Word which still lives and speaks in the church, constructs its services, and actuates all which it promulgates to the world and inculcates on its followers. The article teaches them just this, that they are not so much to judge the church by the Scripture as the Scripture by the church. That where they seem to find these two at variance with each other, they are to conclude that the inconsistency is not real, but apparent, growing not out of a real discrepancy, but originating in the defective intelligence of their own nature, in that spiritual blindness in themselves which faith and obedience will, in due time, by the grace of the sacraments, remove.

"But I may go much further. What I have already said shows that we are to form our judgment of the 'sense' of the Scripture by the practices of the church, as these are exhibited in her worship and her authoritative teaching. Further, however, that teaching, if it have not placed in the hands of the children of our holy mother a commentary, or, as you call it, 'an interpretation,' does place in their hands *canons of interpretation* quite adequate to preserve them from the destructive pitfalls of heretical pravity on the right hand and on the left. Should these canons of interpretation not be quite so vulgar as to puff up every ignorant handicraftsman into the idea that he is himself qualified to quit the shopboard and the lapstone, and turn divine, they are of ready access to all the clergy, and calculated to enable them at once to solve whatever more serious difficulties they find to operate as stumbling-blocks in the way of their people. As I before gave to be understood, the creeds in general—this very creed of Pope Pius IV. in particular, and, as still more full and explicit, the holy council of Trent, (not to mention other authorities,)—furnish these canons of interpretation. I feel certain that a reference to these blessed standards would enable me, though by no means boasting of extraordinary acumen, to form a sufficiently accurate idea of the *sense* in which our holy mother would wish me to interpret any controverted passage of Holy Writ. For example, to take one from the Epistle to the Romans, with respect to which you, reverend sir, express so much confidence—'Therefore, we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law;' (iii. 28;) I know, from the council of

Trent, that our church distinctly negatives the Protestant view of 'justification by faith only.' I am certain, therefore, that this text has not such a meaning. Guided by this certainty, and considering the context, I perceive that the Apostle is combating the idea of the Judaising Christians, who would add to faith in the Messiah a necessity for the observance of the law of Moses in order to justification. The Apostle puts a negative on this view of the subject, and excludes 'the deeds of the law'—viz., the sacrifice of victims, circumcision, the passover, &c., from the office of justifying, and decides that it is 'by faith' a man must be justified; that is, by the Christian faith, involving that humble submission to the church's teaching which leads the Christian to take up all his views from his holy mother: a faith which, though not connected with any dependence on Jewish ordinances, is always accompanied with and recommended by true charity, good hope, and other holy fruits of the Spirit; and that this is a sound view, is confirmed by St. James, who says—'You see, then, how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only.' (ii. 24.) That I may show in a still more striking case the applicability of our canon of interpretation, I will take the latter part of the first commandment (called by you the second), and show how the true Catholic would understand it: 'Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image: thou shalt not bow down to them, &c.' The devil of unbelief would suggest to the believer that here there was a precept violated by the church. Faith, however, comes to his aid, and tells him that he is not to judge of the church by Scripture, but of Scripture by the church—by her mind, by her spirit, by her practice; in a word, by her 'sense.' To solve the difficulty, he reverts to the Tridentine decrees, and there he learns that the worship condemned by the written word is that of pagan idols; but that veneration and *dulia* or *semi-dulia* rendered to the images of canonised saints, or rather to the saints themselves before their images, is acceptable to God, and redounds to the glory of Christ. Hence he will easily gather that the text means, 'Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven idol,' &c.; and that it is not intended to discourage, much less to prohibit, pious devotion to the blessed Virgin, the saints of God and their images, but only to forbid idolatry; that is, 'latry' or *latreia* to any image whatsoever, for *latreia* is only due to God, and all sorts of service or worship towards the molten gods of the heathens. I have taken this extreme case in order that the consideration of it may show with how much facility we may, from the church's canons, collect the church's sense of the Scripture; and thence infer how futile the objections brought against the article in the creed of Pius IV. are. Your Anglican church says, that she 'may not so expound one place of Scripture as that it be repugnant to another.' (Article xx.) The holy Catholic church says, in effect, 'We may not so expound any part of Scripture as that it be repugnant to the sense of the church,' because the church is the Word *speaking*, the Scripture is the Word *written*. Upon the whole, sir, your objection indicates—1st, That you have altogether

misapprehended the scope of the article in our creed, which teaches us to judge the Scripture by the church, and not the church by the Scripture; and 2ndly, that the narrow view which you have taken of the subject has led you to suppose that we have no definite *sense* of Scripture, because no elaborated commentary has been set forth by our authorities; forgetting that a sound canon of interpretation answers all the purposes which such a commentary would yield, and some others besides."

It was in some such way I answered Mr. M'Ghee, when, previously to my discussion with Maguire, he pressed me to act on his system; and I must say that he failed to grapple with my reply; nor do I think he could. Truth compels me to say, in fact, that I think the system of that divine, as to the point under consideration, utterly defective, and calculated, consequently, to produce no valuable results.

The fact is, the church of Rome *has* a sense of the Scriptures, and that sense is, *the spirit of her system*, to wit, "the spirit of bondage again to fear"—the servile spirit of the law; because, according to the largely-revealed foreknowledge of God, she has abrogated the Gospel, that in her midst the great Antichrist might be revealed; and that she, with him, might, in due season, "go to her own place." Such a spirit is her "sense" of the Scriptures; and the rule which she acts on in expressing the "sense" which she "has held, and does hold," is to wrest it to the damnation of the world. Her great crime is, not the negation of any "sense," but the maintenance and promulgation of a corrupt one.

There is another point on which I think undue stress has been laid, and that is, the "novelty" of the articles added to the Nicene creed by Pope Pius IV.

There is no manner of doubt but that these articles are "novel," and that their novelty may serve very well to illustrate the character of the modern apostate sect, which attempts in this country to supplant the ancient church of St. Patrick, but it is on the *falsehood* of the articles that the great emphasis should be laid. I recollect, that in the discussion (to which I have been obliged to refer more often than I could wish), Mr. Maguire on several occasions attempted to run me down by alleging the "novelty" of the thirty-nine articles. He spoke thus in his first speech on the second day:—

I call upon him, my friends, to name a church, from the days of St. Peter down to those of Elizabeth and Edward, by whom the Thirty-nine Articles were manufactured; I call upon him to show me a church that professed those Thirty-nine Articles; I nail him to that; I challenge him to prove the truth of the twenty-two negative articles—and he must give me Scripture proofs; I call upon him to prove them from the Scripture alone; I accuse his church of adding to, and subtracting from, the holy Scriptures.—Page 67, *Church Edition*.

Again:—

But I now defy him to name a single man, woman, or child, for the first 1500 years—before the locusts ascended out of the bottomless pit, and spread themselves

over the world—who ever believed, or professed to believe, the *Thirty-nine Articles*. I challenge him to do this. If he does not, it is evident that his religion is a new religion.—Page 376.

Again :—

I now ask him to name any church, from the days of Martin Luther up to the fifth century, that ever held the *Thirty-nine Articles*. I call upon him to name to me any country or nation on the face of the earth, in which, during that period, there was a church which held his doctrines.—Page 380.

In reply to all this (in pages 138—142, and elsewhere), I gave express texts of Scripture, demonstrating the essentially scriptural character of what my reverend opponent called the "negative articles;" and on the subject of their alleged "novelty," I thus spoke :—

Mr. Maguire says that there never was a church, except our own, which held our *Thirty-nine Articles*. Here he stops—here he reiterates—here he glories. "Where were your *Thirty-nine Articles* for eight hundred years and more? Was there ever a national church which held your *Thirty-nine Articles*? Show me the church which held your *Thirty-nine Articles*." I am astonished, sir, at the weakness that gives rise to your cavil. Now, sir, I affirm that there never was a true church which did not in substance hold every one of them, or, rather that there never was a time when the true church—the spiritual church—the Israel of God—the company of his faithful people, did not hold them. They have ever been substantially held by the church of Christ, because they contain those doctrines which were taught by Jesus Christ and his Apostles—those sound doctrines which, being essential to salvation, have never been allowed to fail; and also, that firm protest against the errors of the apostasy, which the witnesses of God have never ceased to bear, and which I now, in this place, give utterance to. Does Mr. Maguire condescend to such trifling? Does he really think to deceive us? or, is he deceived himself? So, then, because the Articles did not happen to have been arranged under *thirty-nine* heads, they never were held before! They must be entirely false, because they are *thirty-nine* in number!! We have put the doctrines of the holy Scriptures, and of the holy Catholic church, into *thirty-nine* articles; and therefore the doctrines of Jesus Christ, and of the holy church, are false and abominable!!! Why, sir, is the number *thirty-nine* essential to them? You know perfectly well, sir, that the number is a matter of total indifference, and that it is the substance alone which should concern us. But these are the sort of arguments that are used against our church, and which, I grant you, go down well enough with the hearers of the reverend gentleman. I consider it a happy thing that here, before this intelligent audience, their weakness and fatuity should be exposed. I assert, and I am prepared to prove, that the substance of these calumniated *thirty-nine* articles is, and has ever been, the faith of the people of God; that the truths which they contain have never ceased to be sounded forth in the Catholic church. They are now happily the established doctrines of the old, holy, Catholic, and Apostolic church of England and Ireland. It is for you, sir, to show that they do not contain the doctrines of the church of Christ set forth in the holy Scriptures.—Page 382.

Now I beg to submit to the consideration of the candid reader the following idea :—

Suppose a Roman Catholic priest were to enclose within a black border, on a large broad-sheet, our *thirty-nine* articles, or certain extracts taken from them, and to head the scroll thus: "The black articles of the modern church of England;" and to contend that they never were heard of in the church till the time of the Reformation,

and on that circumstance to found an appeal, *ad captandum vulgus*, against the *antiquity* of our principles; alleging, that in consequence of this circumstance of time, those principles were, in point of fact, a *novelty*. Should we be in the slightest degree either confounded or embarrassed by such a proceeding? I trow not; but this much I feel very sure of, that if we, on our part, made the attempt, by the display of that which is called "The Black Creed," to excite a laugh against Popery, such a proceeding as that which I have supposed with respect to our articles, would go down with Roman Catholics as a perfectly valid reply, and that the laugh would be just as loud on their side, as that would be which "the black creed" might elicit from the Protestants.

The real fact of the matter is this, that the false principles appended by Pius IV. to the Nicene creed, express distinctly enough the errors which prevailed in the church of Rome from that great period, so admirably ascertained by Mr. Faber, from which the completion of the great apostasy is to be dated. The prophet Daniel distinguishes the era (chap. viii. 23) as the time "when the transgressors are come to the full;" and Mr. Faber proves, with a degree of clearness which renders his proof something like mathematical demonstration, that that period is distinguished by the coincidence of two most remarkable events, the first being the award by the bloodstained emperor Phocas of the title of "Universal Bishop" to the Pope; and the second, immediately subsequent to that, the rise of the impostor Mahomet in the east.

The tenor of the prophetic Scripture is this, that the church of Christ should in the main fall into idolatry, which should nearly altogether corrupt it; that it should crown this apostasy by conceding a tyrannical lordship over the whole church to the bishop of Rome; that when this took place, and "the transgressors were thus come to the full," God would, in vengeance, raise up a great deistical power, who, by force of arms, should judicially trample upon idolatrous Christendom, and compel those whom idolatry had made virtual apostates by a renunciation of Christ, to become literally such. All this Mr. Faber, in his "Calendar of Prophecy," following in the footsteps of the Protestant commentators who preceded him, most clearly proves. And his views are most remarkably justified by our church herself in her Homilies, as the following extracts will show. There can scarcely be a doubt, but that for the providential occurrence of the Reformation, all Europe, if not the whole world, would now be under the sway of the Turkish power.

But of Gregory's opinion, thinking that images might be suffered in churches, so it were taught that they should not be worshipped; what ruin of religion, and what mischief ensued afterward to all Christendom, experience hath, to our great hurt and sorrow, proved. First, by the schism arising between the East and the West church about the said images. Next, by the division of the empire into two parts, by the same occasion of images, to the great weakening of all Christendom; whereby, last of all, hath followed the utter overthrow of the Christian religion, and noble empire in Greece, and all the east parts of the world, and the increase of

Mahomet's false religion, and the cruel dominion and tyranny of the Saracens and Turks, who do now hang over our necks also, that dwell in the west parts of the world, ready at all occasions to overrun us. And all this we do owe unto our idols and images, and our idolatry in worshipping of them.—*Homily against Peril of Idolatry*, p. 216.

Again:—

Thus we see what a sea of mischiefs the maintenance of images hath brought with it ; what an horrible schism between the East and the West church ; what an hatred between one church and another ; councils against councils, church against church, Christians against Christians, princes against princes ; rebellions, treasons, unnatural and most cruel murders ; the daughter digging up and burning her father the emperor's body ; the mother, for love of idols, most abominably murdering her own son, being an emperor ; at the last, the tearing in sunder of Christendom and the empire into two pieces, till the infidels, Saracens, and Turks, (common enemies to both parts,) have most cruelly vanquished, destroyed, and subdued the one part, the whole empire of Greece, Asia the Less, Thracia, Macedonia, Epirus, and many other great and goodly countries and provinces, and have won a great piece of the other empire, and put the whole in dreadful fear and most horrible danger. For it is not without a just and great cause to be dreaded, lest, as the empire of Rome was, even for the like cause of images and the worshipping of them, torn in pieces and divided ; as was, for idolatry, the kingdom of Israel in old time divided ; so like punishment, as for the like offence, fell upon the Jews, will also light upon us : that is, lest the cruel tyrant and enemy of our commonwealth and religion, the Turk, by God's just vengeance, in likewise partly murder, and partly lead away into captivity us Christians, as did the Assyrian and Babylonian kings murder and lead away the Israelites ; and lest the empire of Rome and Christian religion be so utterly brought under foot, as was then the kingdom of Israel and true religion of God, whereunto the matter already (as I have declared) shrewdly inclineth on our part, the greater part of Christendom, within less than three hundred years' space, being brought into captivity and most miserably thralldom under the Turk, and the noble empire of Greece clean averted. Whereas, if the Christians, divided by those image matters, had holden together, no infidels and miscreants could thus have prevailed against Christendom. And all this mischief and misery which we have hitherto fallen into, do we owe to our mighty gods of gold and silver, stock and stone, in whose help and defence (where they cannot help themselves) we have trusted so long, until our enemies, the infidels, have overcome and overrun us almost altogether. A just reward for those that have left the mighty living God, the Lord of Hosts, and have stooped and given the honour due to him to dead blocks and stocks, who have eyes and see not, ears and hear not, feet and cannot go, and so forth, and are cursed of God, and all they that make them and that put their trust in them.—*Homily against Peril of Idolatry*, p. 228.

A very strong testimony to the same effect will be found in the second part of the homily on "the Place and Time of Prayer."

From this it may be argued, that our divines wisely concluded that the apostasy reached its acme when the title of "universal bishop" was awarded to the Pope. The church thus, by the dethronement of Jesus Christ, filled up the measure of that guilt which its practical idolatry had been so long accumulating. Thus did she invest the Pope with the title of "king of kings, and lord of lords ;" and place upon his head the crown of three worlds. When this act was done, God, by his providence, raised up Mahomet to scourge apostate Christendom. The armed force which obeyed that arch-heretic—the eastern

Antichrist—was overwhelming in its power; it crushed beneath it, like the overwhelming rush of an avalanche, the enfeebled worshippers of stocks and stones. All Asia sank beneath its power. Throughout the territory of the seven churches, the cross was supplanted by the crescent, Thrace was overrun, Greece fell, Spain was taken possession of, and but for the intervention of the Reformation, which compelled the Euphrates to flow within its ancient banks, the world itself, at the present day, would scarcely have had one kingdom which owned the dominion of Christ.

Now, from the remarkable era to which I have referred—that of the acknowledgement of the Pope's supremacy—down to the present day, the false principles which Pope Pius IV. embodied in the article added to the Nicene creed, have existed in the church of Rome and her connexions, and have constituted the evidences of her awful apostasy. The creed is a very convenient embodiment of the mass of Roman error. It is quite providential that we should have thus authoritatively concentrated her spiritual abominations; but it is absolutely essential, as well to her conviction as for our justification, and still more especially for the justification of our reformers, to take right good care that we do not allow Rome to date the apostasy which this creed brands upon her brow from the time in which it was produced. The creed, indeed, is "novel," but the heresies which it sets forth are antiquated; if this creed, however, be the justification of our secession from Rome, what shall justify the reformers who came out from her before it had any existence? The Waldenses, centuries before the creed was written, recognised the church of Rome as the body of Antichrist; and from the time when they stood forth as "witnesses" against her, down to the days of Luther, there was a constant succession of faithful men, who pronounced her as apostate from the faith. Hence I consider that there may be serious embarrassment brought upon the maintenance of the Roman Catholic controversy, if we fall into the error of supposing that the "novelty" of this creed is one of the most important points connected with it.

I trust that, in the observations which I have made on the above subjects, it may not be supposed that I am animated by any the slightest possible hostility to the brethren from whose judgment I humbly differ, or that I am moved by a paltry inclination to convert my own views into the *shibboleth* of a party. I think it, however, essential to lay before the church the grounds on which I regard those modes of proceeding which I have described as objectionable. I apprehend that there is little of benefit to be expected from that sort of agreement that is likely to result from overlooking the differences which exist among parties who do not, in fact, walk together. We must not compromise principle for courtesy sake, nor flatter ourselves that unity exists because we shrink from dwelling upon those points on which we are at variance. I candidly lay before the Protestant public the views which I esteem as sound. In a spirit of the utmost friend-

liness, I invite the consideration of my valued friends to those all-important points; and I do earnestly hope that such a conclusion may be come to on them, as will enable us, with one heart and one mind, successfully to combat the mortal enemy of our country's peace, and of the happiness, both for time and for eternity, of our Roman Catholic fellow subjects. Especially with respect to our distinguished countryman, Robert M'Ghee, I trust that I may not be mistaken either by him or others. I should be indifferent to very extraordinary ability if I failed to value the qualities of that laborious divine; and I am sure that I should not only forfeit, but deserve to forfeit, the friendship of Irish Protestants, were I capable of either disparaging his labours or setting light by his views. If I do not quite mistake, he has occasionally thought my judgment questionable. Indeed I have again and again been made aware that, with respect to myself and my efforts in the Protestant cause, it has been alleged that I was "not judicious." Now I beg that it may be understood that it is on the express score of soundness of judgment on the topics in question, that I put in the claim to my share of the regard of the church. Here I submit the whole question to the Christian world. That I should contend for victory over one or more Protestants would mark me as contemptible. The establishment of truth alone is that which I aim at. If I be wrong in the views which I lay down, this much at least I can say, I am sincere; let my error, or errors, in that case be pointed out, and I shall most cordially acknowledge it or them.

I cannot yet take my leave of the creed of Pope Pius IV. I am quite aware of the immense importance of that extraordinary instrument in the Roman Catholic controversy. Its great importance, however, derives not from the "novelty," but the *falsehood* of the appended articles. I am quite sure that Mr. M'Ghee realizes, as fully as any one can possibly do, the latter point. Indeed, it would be difficult to find language stronger than his own in assertion of the falsehood of the articles. In a number of objections to the increased grant to the College of Maynooth, which he sent to Dr. Montague, president of the college at the time when the proposition for that increase was before the public, he thus wrote—

Secondly—Because these twelve novel articles are utterly irreconcilable with God's Holy Word, and that the priests educated at the college, Maynooth, are unable to reconcile them with the Sacred Volume; that it is therefore a criminal act in a government calling itself Christian, to educate a body of men under the name of Christian ministers, who are wholly unable to reconcile the creed which they teach with the only standard of the Christian faith, the Word of the Holy God; and that those who teach them that creed, and educate them to teach it to others, make themselves thereby partakers of their sin.

This quotation really expresses that which is the valid objection to the creed of Pope Pius, whereas the "novelty" of the articles in question is to a great extent an unimportant circumstance, which, if improperly rested upon, is capable of producing, as I before explained, no inconsiderable embarrassment to the advocate of the truth; and

not only so, it is calculated to act as a stumbling block in the way of Roman Catholics, by diverting their attention from that which is really our valid ground for objecting to the creed.

To illustrate what I say. Suppose that our church, in consideration of the errors which abound at the present day, should think it expedient to fix the attention of her children upon those errors, by attaching them to the Nicene creed—not intending by doing this, to persuade them that the document thus increased, was that which, in the fourth century was promulgated by the Nicene fathers, but merely with the view of thus assuring them of the great importance of the errors denounced—would there be any serious objection to the proceeding?

To make the contrast more plain, I will place a set of my *supposititious* articles in juxta-position with the articles of Pope Pius IV.

THE TWELVE POPISH ARTICLES OF
POPE PIUS IV.

New but not true.

"I. I most steadfastly admit and embrace the Apostolical and Ecclesiastical Traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the same [the Roman] Church.

"II. I also admit the Holy Scripture according to that sense which our Holy Mother, the Church, has held and does hold, to which it belongs, to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures; neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

"III. I also profess that there are truly and properly seven Sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one; to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony, and that they confer grace; and that of these, Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders cannot be reite-

TWELVE SOUND PROTESTANT
ARTICLES.

True although new.

I. I most steadfastly renounce and protest against the Apostatical and lying traditions, superatitions, observances, and unholy constitutions of the Church of Rome.

II. I also declare that *she* wrests the Holy Scriptures to the damnation of mankind, by perverting the sense thereof contrary to the unanimous consent of all enlightened Christian men.

III. I also profess, that *she* has falsely and improperly added to the two sacraments of the Gospel instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, five additional ordinances of a totally different nature and character; and I also renounce and abjure the detestable ceremonies which *she* uses in the administration of her so-called sacraments, which ceremonies are no better, in the main, than the

rated without sacrilege: and I also receive and admit the received and approved ceremonies of the Catholic Church, used in the solemn administration of all the aforesaid Sacraments.

"IV. I embrace and receive all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the Holy Council of Trent, concerning original sin and justification.

"V. I profess, likewise, that in the mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist there are truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood; which conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation. I also confess, that under either kind alone, Christ is received whole and entire, and a true Sacrament.

"VI. I constantly hold that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.

"VII. Likewise, that the saints reigning together with Christ, are to be honoured and invoked; and that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be held in veneration.

practices of magicians and of sorcerers.

IV. I also renounce and abjure the heretical doctrine concerning original sin and justification declared by the Unholy Council of Trent.

V. I renounce, likewise, the mass as a foul idol, involving blasphemy against God and destruction to the souls of men. I profess and declare that I am convinced that the real object of that blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit, is to deprive the people of the real body and blood of Christ, which they receive by faith into their souls, in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, as administered in Christ's holy Catholic church, protesting against Rome.

VI. I am firmly convinced that purgatory is an invention of the mass-priests of Rome, designed to enable them to put their hands into the pockets of their deluded victims, and calculated to overwhelm in ruin their immortal souls.

VII. Likewise that, of the "Saints," held up for veneration by the church of Rome, some are merely fictitious characters, who never existed at all; others are persons who, having existed, have no title to the name of saints; that none of them, by any means, should be invoked or addressed

"VIII. I most firmly assert that the images of Christ, of the Mother of God, ever virgin, and also of other saints, may be had and retained; and that due honour and veneration are to be given them.

"IX. I also affirm that the power of Indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people.

"X. I acknowledge the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church for the Mother and Mistress of all Churches; and I promise true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, Successor to St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.

"XI. I likewise undoubtedly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the Sacred Canons and general Councils, and particularly by the Holy Council of Trent; and I condemn, reject, and anathematise all things contrary thereto, and all heresies which the Church has condemned, rejected, and anathematized.

"XII. I, N. N., do at this present freely profess and sincerely hold this true Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved! and I promise most constantly to retain and confess the same entire and inviolate, with God's assistance, to the end of my life."

in prayer; and moreover, that what are set forth as their "relics," are in general no "relics" at all, but the remains, perhaps, of knaves, rogues, murderers, or profane persons.

VIII. I most firmly assert that it is a horrible abomination in the sight of God to retain any sort of image whatsoever, in order to render to it any degree of religious veneration.

IX. I also affirm that the "power of Indulgences" is nothing more than a money-making imposture, intended to enrich an antichristian priesthood.

X. I acknowledge the Unholy, Schismatical, Apostatic Roman Church, for "the Mother of Harlots and abominations of the earth;" and I promise to wage a holy war so long as my life doth last against the Bishop of Rome, Successor of Judas, "the Son of Perdition," "the Man of Sin," and the foretold "Antichrist" of the latter times.

XI. I likewise, undoubtedly, recognise the Council of Trent as a synod of apostates, whose object was to extirpate the Church of Christ, and to ratify the countless heresies which the Church of Rome had long before introduced, adopted, and promulgated.

XII. I, N. N., do at this present thus record my sincere protest against the great Roman Apostasy, and trust that I may be enabled constantly to act in a manner consistent with the hostility which I bear to the awful corruptions and delusions of Popery.

I think it plain that there would be no great profaneness in connecting with the Nicene creed, in some such way as I have attempted above, important Christian verities. To pretend, indeed, that what might be thus added were part and parcel of the original, would be highly improper. False, however, as are the articles of Pope Pius IV., they make no pretensions, so far as they constitute the creed in question, to antiquity—they include in their midst, a distinct avowal of their modern publication, inasmuch as they pledge those who receive them to submission to the decrees of the council of Trent—a council which sat, as every one knows, since the Reformation. In effect, the articles in question are just such a protest against Protestantism, as our thirty-nine articles are against Popery; save and except that our protest is scriptural, the Popish protest anti-scriptural. However, as a disclaimer of the doctrines of the Reformation, they are of course, in point of time, posterior to the spread of those doctrines which they were designed to counteract. To raise a cry against them, then, on the score of their “novelty,” is obviously idle, inasmuch as they were distinctly constructed to meet and oppose what they regard as modern errors.

Had the Roman Catholic church superseded the original creed by the new one, the case would be different. But she retains both together. The simple history of the new creed is this. The divines who composed the council of Trent being unable themselves to agree on a formula which would embody for the use of the church those principles which the council had agreed on, and which negated the principles of the reformers, committed to the reigning Pope the task of framing such a formula. Pope Pius IV. accordingly undertook the task, and determined to make the creed of Nice the basis of that which he had to draw up. The Nicene creed he considered an adequate expression of undisputed truth; and the new articles embodied, in fact, those heresies of the Roman Catholic church, which, existing in it from a remote antiquity, had ever been protested against by God's faithful witnesses, and at last produced the Reformation. Every well-informed Roman Catholic knows the history of the thing, and every sincere one holds the debated articles to be true—just as true, for example, as we should regard any series of scriptural statements which we could establish against Popish error; and since this is so, can we avoid supposing that when he finds himself assailed on account of the “novelty” of this particular document—when from its obvious design it could not be otherwise than novel—he should attribute the assault to ignorance, or weakness, or both combined together, on the part of those who engaged in the assault?

I am well aware that when the council of Nice adopted the Nicene creed, they ratified a canon or decree, anathematising any person, or persons, who should add to or diminish from it; and that thence it may be conceived that there may be peculiar guilt involved in making any additions to it. I question, however, whether the anathema of a general council would weigh much in the Protestant mind, if the

articles added were scriptural; and if it would not, it cannot be supposed to press very heavily upon the conscience of the Roman Catholic who may think them so to be. With a case against Rome that is perfectly unexceptionable, it is a great pity that we should allow ourselves to turn aside to cavils which are puerile, so easily refuted that they make no impression upon the adversary, and so weak that they prejudice the power of the overwhelming truths which we are appointed to promulgate.

I confess that it is not without a considerable sense of pain that I am obliged to differ, in the views that I take of the Roman Catholic controversy, from brethren with whom in all the essential articles of the Christian faith I most cordially agree. In these essential points there exists between us *unitas unissima*, and on that account I have felt it the more difficult to bring myself publicly to refer to our minor differences. This difficulty is rendered still more considerable from the feeling which exists in Ireland. There is a disposition on the part of a great many in our country, to conclude that an appeal *ad verecundiam* should be considered as valid in all such cases as that at present in question. "Surely you would not think of bringing into doubt the rectitude of our dear brother's sentiments!" "Surely an evangelical doctor so distinguished, must, in his opinions on such a matter, be at once submitted to; and, at least, should you differ from him, you would not think of making the difference a matter of notoriety!" Such language as this expresses the current of feeling which prevails amongst Protestant clergymen and the Christian public in Ireland. I am afraid that it is a feeling not just calculated to obtain for truth its due ascendancy. Let us have "in essentials, unity; in non-essentials, liberty; in all things, charity." But to relinquish liberty of speaking as to non-essentials—particularly when those non-essentials may be highly important—is to shut them out from the advantage likely to result from discussion; and the plea of charity employed to exclude them from consideration and debate, would operate in a way likely to be upon the whole hostile to the growth and cultivation of true and wholesome charity. It was this conviction which, in the first instance, led me to decide that my Thoughts should be untrammelled and "free;" and I entertain a very strong hope that the freedom of observation which I have allowed myself, and which I am still determined to use the privilege of employing, will greatly contribute to lead to unity of action among churchmen. Perhaps I may not myself be favoured in my own time to witness the production of this blessed result, but the lapse of a very few years will sweep us all from that stage on which we now temporarily play our part. The bias of prejudice will die away as the grass upon our graves flourishes and floats in the breeze; and the generation which is growing up around, and will survive us, will come to its conclusion without fear, favour, affection, or partiality. It is for this ultimate prevalence of truth I labour.

CHAPTER III.

ESSENTIAL IMPORTANCE, AT THE PRESENT CRISIS, OF EARNESTNESS
IN RELIGION.

What a glorious epoch our lot is cast in! Light and knowledge of a scientific sort, are diffused far and wide. Boundless facilities for the obtainment of moral truth are at hand. What a privilege at such a time as this to be "stewards of the mysteries of God;" to be commissioned to dispense them to every family of the children of men, and above all, through their instrumentality, to break down those barriers which exclude from their healing influence the victims of Popish delusion! Let Babylon tremble to her foundations, the tide of truth is flowing in upon her, and it will—

Like

The Pontic sea, ne'er know returning ebb.

Those arts and sciences which Protestantism has given birth to and nourished up, are now prepared to act in the service of their glorious parent. Any one of them, however directly bearing upon her interests, would be to a great extent inefficient without the rest. Vast as has been the revolution which the art of printing has undergone, of what avail would it be, if we could not, with almost the rapidity of lightning, circulate the publications that it supplies us with? Would the *London Times* exhibit its present huge dimensions, if the journey to York were now, as it was some years ago, the pilgrimage of a week? Confined, as under such circumstances the journal would be, almost to the readers of one single city, wherefore the extension of its columns? wherefore their multiplication by the giant power of steam? Archdeacon Paley dwells in his "Evidences," with the emphasis of a true philosopher, on the circumstance that the Messiah was sent at a moment when the ambition of Rome had just completed immense lines of road-way, which branched off from the seat of her empire in Italy to its utmost limits—limits which, at that day, were coincident with the boundaries of the known world. It was to facilitate the march of her troops, as they were sent forth to trample upon the nations, that these roads were intended. But for them, her armies would have had to traverse pathless wilds, where they would constantly have been subject to the covert attacks of their enemies, and been entirely dependent on mercenary guides. He, however, who held in his hands the destinies of mankind, contemplated a result of her ambition that she never dreamt of: the roads that she formed for her warriors were intended by Supreme Wisdom to be the pathways of those whose "feet should be shod with the preparation of the Gospel of peace." Mercy reached mankind through those issues which were designed to make them the

victims of tyrannical power. Is not a similar purpose manifest at the present moment? To what end countless millions expended on railway schemes? Has Providence no end in view higher and more glorious than that which their projectors contemplate—that they should be subservient to the gratification of an unfeeling covetousness? No; they are intended to give ubiquity to the blasts of the trumpet which will prostrate to the earth the walls of that spiritual Jericho—Babylon the great. The minister will thunder in the morning in Dublin, and in the evening his voice will be heard at St. Jarlath's. Now he will preach in London, and in the lapse of a few transitory hours, Rome will re-echo with his voice. Science has furnished him with wings fraught with a rapidity that surpasses the speed of eagles. O let us not mistake the nature of our message; let us not damage the noblest cause that was ever committed to the guardianship of men, by misconceiving the terms on which it should be maintained. When we should be putting our heel upon the head of the serpent, let us not waste our time by endeavouring to inflict wounds which, however they may irritate, cannot destroy.

He must be utterly dead to spiritual truth, who is unable to discern the cause of the relative positions which, at the present moment, Popery and Protestantism occupy in this country. The Papists have been admitted to a full and equal participation of constitutional privileges with their Protestant fellow-countrymen; nay, in some respects they occupy a higher position than they. The State richly endows a seminary for the exclusive education of their clergy, whereas the ancient foundation intended to educate Protestant ministers, is open to all parties. Their chaplains in national institutions are more amply rewarded than those of the Protestants; and their claim to equality in all respects being recognised, their vast majority affords them, in special cases, a preponderating influence. In effect, they are fast rising to ascendancy, and it is as obvious as possible, that the recognition of their claim to equality, if it be undisturbed, must, whether they will or no, ultimately render them ascendant. While this is the progress of things on one hand, how does it fare with Protestantism? It is depressed, discouraged, discountenanced. We may apply to our church a sentiment ordinarily employed in a very different service.

'Tis treason to love her, and death to defend.

Her bishops have been toppled down, as Dr. M'Hale loves to phrase it, like "nine pins;" her property has been plundered, one-fourth of her tithes handed over to the landlords, and the fee of her lands alienated; an immense per centage is annually levied off every clergyman whose income rises above the starvation standard; all her muniments have been prostrated to the earth—the corporations, the charter schools, the national scriptural schools; and the weakness through which she has suffered the aggression of her assailants, has, to a great extent, brought into disregard the principles which she promulgates.

Now, whence is all this? Is it that statesmen do not know that Popery is an objectionable and a dangerous system? Is it that they are ignorant of the history of those blood-stained periods when she ruled supreme over the nations? Is it that they suppose her changed or changeable? I am convinced that not one of these affords an explanation of the present deplorable state of things. I am perfectly convinced that demonstrations of her dangerous character, severe as those which prove mathematical truth, would not in the slightest degree operate to produce a legislation adverse to her pretensions. No. The true secret of all that we witness is a latent infidelity, a fundamental and wide-spread indifference to the very Word of God himself; and vain will every effort against Popery prove which is not primarily calculated to lead men to the study of the Scripture, and to the apprehension for themselves of its heart-converting spiritualities.

I am forced to the conclusion which I here draw, from the progress of conviction in my own mind. I am as certain as I am that I live, that, were I ever so zealous a Protestant, without having experienced for myself the power of religion, without having been brought to realize its supernatural operation upon the human mind, I would never offer to Roman Catholics anything but the opposition of a bigotry that would be carnal, worldly, and self-interested in its character, and which never would produce in my mind a state of feeling that would not be overborne by circumstances, and governed in its workings by mere expediency. As it is, I dare not stand still against Popery. My course is marked out for me by God himself; and though it involved death in the most painful shape, though it were connected with results of the most disturbing character upon society, I am driven onward, sustained by the commandment and the encouragement of Heaven.

In order that my readers may understand what I mean, and see in the clearest possible manner the nature and origin of my opposition to Popery, I think it proper here to insert an extract from *The Witness*, page 205-7, which I wrote in Sheffield, in the year 1836.

"The strongest reasons that exist for the exclusion of Papists from Parliament are of a religious sort. I defy any man to read his Bible, to become imbued with its spirit, and to be well informed as to the true character of Popery, and not to feel that a curse must necessarily be expected to abide on the country so long as idolatrous apostates form a part of its Legislature. Independent, indeed, of religious feelings growing out of a spiritual acquaintance with the Word of God, I cannot conceive that men can be sufficiently alive to the evil of the present ungodly amalgamation of opposites, of truth and falsehood—God and Belial. More common sense may lead ordinary Protestants to see that the existence of Papists in the Legislature is an evil; but they will never feel its true magnitude, nor be moved in consequence to grapple with it. In order to this, scriptural religion must be brought home to the mind by the Holy Ghost.

"There is nothing that I find more satisfactory than a plain statement of the progress of thought in the minds of considerative men on any important subject. I shall therefore beg to be allowed the liberty of giving a brief history of the experience of my own mind as touching the matter in hand. I was early imbued with very decided Protestant feelings, and taught to regard Popery as an irrational and anti-scriptural system. The opportunities that were afforded me, from having spent much of my earlier days among Roman Catholics, of comparing their opinions and practice with the doctrines of Scripture and its precepts, which, thanks be to God, were always diligently inculcated upon my mind, quite confirmed all the reasonings against Popery that were brought before me in a circle of religious acquaintance.

"As I grew up, however, and read the newspapers, and took an interest in the opinions eloquently put forth by public men, my early impressions began to be considerably modified. I felt charmed by the Liberal sentiments so forcibly urged by popular orators, and began to conceive a mistrust of the soundness of the opinions that I had been educated in. I felt that they might perhaps have sprung from mere prejudice. In proportion as I mixed with the world, grew into a relish for its pleasures, and was afforded an opportunity for indulging in them, religion was felt to be quite a secondary consideration, and, indeed, regarded altogether as perhaps rather questionable in its foundation. Infidelity is natural to the heart of man, and is sure to be fostered by the gratification of a worldly spirit. I remember well, when my mind was just in this state, that I was in the habit of taking early morning walks along the beach and the embankments of the bay of Dublin, in order that I might enjoy the prospect of the green waves, and the refreshing influences of the sea breezes. I often stopped to view the workmen that are almost constantly engaged at the entrances of the port of Dublin, and in the bed of the river there, under the direction of the Ballast Board, in clearing away the *alluvia* which, by rendering the water shallow, might retard or endanger vessels at their ingress or egress. I used to admire on these occasions the industry of my hardy countrymen as they laboured for hours, from the earliest dawn, immersed in water to the middle, at their most irksome and fatiguing work, displaying a degree of patience and good humour that was truly admirable. Their brawny muscles, their exemplary endurance, their great strength, and their rare pleasantry, were as ten thousand arguments with me in favour of Roman Catholic emancipation. I used to reflect—'Why should these fine fellows lie under any political disadvantage? wherefore should they be placed under circumstances a whit inferior to my own? They curse and swear, they drink and carouse, but so do Protestants; and as to speculative disagreements on religious matters, I do not see why such things should make the difference that they do.' Analogous reasonings and observations constantly recurring made a very considerable impression on my mind, and by degrees I became all but a professed Liberal. 'I had forgotten the instructions of my father. I had almost forsaken the law of my mother.' (Prov. i. 8.) At this time

I was a student at the University. The Roman Catholic Association was in its glory; and the general notice that its proceedings attracted, induced me to go there to hear the orators. I was much struck with the proceedings on those occasions. Mr. Sheil's rhetoric and bombast had some attractions for my misjudging mind; but I confess that which most of all impressed me was the business-like talents of Mr. O'Connell, and the awkwardness and inefficiency of almost every other individual connected with that memorable club. In fact, Mr. O'Connell was himself the 'Catholic Association.' He created it. He sustained it. He was the spirit that troubled the waters. Let the assembly be ever so numerous, it was stagnant till his arrival. That event put all in motion. His brain seemed fertile with fresh expedients to accomplish his ends. He used to bring his plans and resolutions all regularly written out on papers with which his prolific hat teemed. One was scarcely disposed of before another made its appearance. He urged his views without any affectation of eloquence; but he was never deficient in sufficiently persuasive language, nor in any of the arts of popular address, when a mischievous fool was to be laughed down, an enemy to be crushed, or a friend to be drawn over to his views. I say I attended these debates many a time and many another, and was almost persuaded to be a professed emancipator.

"However, all this time, while Popery and Liberalism were currying favour with my mind, there was an underwork going on. I never could bring myself to be an open infidel. A very early study and sincere admiration of 'Paley's Evidences' instrumentally prevented this. But I dare say all the various shades of error, Popery, Socinianism, Unitarianism, &c., at different times, and in various degrees, held possession of my mind, which was counteracted on with very considerable power by that admirable work, 'Butler's Analogy,' which forms part of the course of University study at Trinity College; while an argument well put in some of the sermons which I would occasionally hear, more and more convinced me that there was 'something in religion.' Still, whatever my convictions may have been, they were certainly, as to all practical results, ineffectual.

"However, at this time it pleased Him who rides through the earth on his white horse, conquering and to conquer, to shoot one of the arrows of his bow deep into my heart. In a word, the Spirit of God with terrible energy convinced me that I was a lost sinner. Hell, as it were, opened before me; and the agonies of my mind at the recollection of my ruined condition were intolerable. I sought for rest, but found none, until at length, after various fruitless attempts to obtain a legal justification it occurred to me to *try the experiment* of endeavouring to be saved in the way that I had so often heard of, but had always hitherto disregarded, to wit, by faith alone in Jesus Christ without the works of the law; without adding any vows, promises, or resolutions of my own. I was thus brought to the foot of the cross. I pleaded the merits of a Saviour's death. I earnestly sought for his intercession, and on a sudden, the depth of midnight

darkness and miserable despondency were succeeded by a bright assurance of acceptance in the Beloved, and a hope full of immortality. Language utterly fails me to express the excessive astonishment with which I found myself suddenly made a new creature. At first I imagined myself to be the only person in the world that was brought to such a state. I felt myself placed, with respect to privileges, on, as it were, a level with apostles, and on an eminence above the prophets. I felt that true religion was an inspiration from on High, and that all around me who, as I had done, looked upon themselves as altogether Christians, were totally deceived, as I had myself up to this moment been. I said within myself, 'Surely I never heard Christianity described as such a thing as this.' I can truly say, although not by very far as tender-hearted as most, I was dissolved into tears, and wept from intense joy. As soon as my mind became a little calm, I began to recollect that there was a body of people in the world whom I and all others of my acquaintance scoffed at as saints, because they spoke of a new light and such things; and I began to reflect that perhaps they might all have been brought to a similar state of feeling with myself. I can scarcely say with how much curiosity I longed for the morning, that I might hasten to an acquaintance who bore this character, a truly good and learned man, confessedly the first Hebrew scholar then in Ireland, that I might consult with him as to the remarkable circumstance that had occurred to me. I lost no time in seeing this gentleman, and I found that my conjectures were quite correct; that this body—though set at nought of men—were, in fact, those who had experienced, like myself, the power of the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven; that this influence was called a spiritual baptism, a baptism of fire, and the new birth unto righteousness, which, while the generality confessed in words, they were altogether ignorant of the power of; that, in fact, to be a true Christian, a man *'must be born again.'*

"With this event all my views became altered. I saw religion, the world, mankind, myself, everything in fact, in a new light. New hopes, new wishes, new fears, began to exist in my mind. 'Old things had passed away, behold all things were become new.' And, perhaps, above all others, my views of Scripture truth, and with respect to Scripture itself, obtained quite a new character. Parts that I had before judged absolutely unintelligible, were now as clear as the day; and the whole book, which before, while it was regarded with an habitual respect, had little or no practical effect upon my life and opinions, began to be estimated at something like its true value. I felt the love of God shed abroad in my heart through the Holy Ghost that was given to me; his divine grace had so altered my mind, that it became my meat and drink to do his will, and I consequently regarded as the very highest authority that volume in which it was revealed. I perceived that the most admirable displays of human wisdom, the most profound and elaborate arguments, could be nothing better at bottom than folly and vanity if they ran counter to any plain

truth or principle of Scripture. Thus, then, all my fine notions about liberalism, and prejudices, and popular equality as it was ordinarily sought for, were blown away like a handful of chaff.

"In effect, upon a diligent study of the Scripture, I perceived that perhaps that thing which was more constantly forbidden than any other thing whatsoever, was an amalgamation between God's people and idolaters. The whole history of the Jews, as recorded in the Old Testament, seemed almost as if simply intended to illustrate this important truth. God commanded his people to have nothing to say to these idolaters; 'Thou shalt make no covenant with them, lest it be for a snare in the midst of thee. Ye shall destroy their altars, break their images, and cut down their groves. For thou shalt worship no other God; for the Lord, whose name is Jealous, is a jealous God, lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land, and thou go a whoring after their gods, and do sacrifice unto their gods, and one call thee and thou eat of his sacrifice; and thou take of their daughters unto thy sons, and their daughters go a whoring after their gods, and make thy sons go a whoring after their gods.' (Exod. xxxiv.) Such precepts as these are repeated, and repeated, and repeated again, and yet, notwithstanding this, the history tells us that the people under various views of 'expediency,' disregarded these commandments, cultivated alliances that were forbidden, and brought down upon their heads all the thunders of the wrath of the Almighty. They were scourged: they were smitten. They were cut off by famine and pestilence. Their land was devoured by the fire and sword of their adversaries. They were carried into captivity after captivity; in a word, the fault never was committed without bringing with it desolation and death. I say this truth is so repeated, so enforced, so illustrated by recorded facts, in the book which the Spirit of God had taught me to regard with boundless reverence, that my mind was instantly decided on the point that had so long agitated it. Dark as my views were at that time as to the exact nature of Popish idolatry, I felt that Papists were idolaters, and that as such our course with respect to them as to our mode of dealing with them was strictly marked out for us. Indeed, the importance of these views was abundantly illustrated in the case of Britain herself, whose history shows us that she has ever been weak in proportion as her political conduct has been Popish in its tendency; while a policy decidedly Protestant has never failed to be accompanied by national blessings.

"Excuse me, gentle reader, that I should trouble you with the history of my opinions. I have done it with this view: to wit, God himself tells us that as in 'the water face answereth to face, so the heart of man to man.' The influences that bear on one mind, however humble, act in a similar manner (perhaps it would be better to say, in an analogous manner) upon all minds, even those of the most exalted. Mark, then, just in proportion as one sets little store by the Word of God, and drinks into the spirit of the world, he will become indifferent to those spiritual distinctions which, after all, are the most

important. And just in proportion as the Holy Ghost brings home to his mind with power those truths which we all profess to revere, just in that proportion will he be enabled to set at nought and trample on that fictitious philanthropy, which the world so much admires, but which is mawkish, romantic, nonsensical, and totally at variance with the true welfare of those towards whom it creates an interest. Liberalism professes to make us love men, while it makes us indifferent to their vices; but, notwithstanding all its professions, it leaves us hateful and hating one another. True religion shows us the odious character of sin and wickedness, and the true remedy for them; and desires us to exercise our philanthropy, not in sparing the vicious and making the vain endeavour to love their persons, but in reclaiming them from their vices; that they may become truly the objects of our esteem. It is then a spurious, a dark, an ignorant philanthropy, growing out of either professed or practical infidelity, that has admitted Papists to parliament, and keeps them there."

We have more than philosophy to assure us of the truth of the maxim above quoted, that "as in the water face answereth to face, so the heart of man to man;" countless every-day incidents assure me that this is, indeed, a sound proverb. I see on all hands the ineffectiveness of endeavours to move men against Popery who are not themselves alive to scriptural truth. For myself, I am sure, that if my Protestantism were simply the traditional zeal that had come to me from education, I should spurn at efforts to deal with a strong hand against our Irish evil; and as it is, I regard with a sort of antipathy mere demonstrations of the dangers likely to arise to Protestants from the persecuting and encroaching spirit of the Church of Rome. Most assuredly such demonstrations would never move me. That because certain "decrees" may authorise them to persecute "heretics," overthrow the church or the settlement of property, seek the restoration of the forfeited estates, or commit other atrocities, I should be called upon to resist the Papists, does to a certain extent make my gorge rise. There is a principle of generosity in the mind of man, that is in some degree wounded by such appeals. They constitute an argument to his cowardice, from which there is a sort of instinctive shrinking, at least, within the breast of one who never experienced any such feeling at all; and if it were made plain as light to me, that the Pope and his priests were all sworn to hostility against Protestants, the simple effect on my mind would be, the production of a conviction that they could not injure me, and that resistance to the attempt to do so would be time enough when it was made. I feel perfectly sure that such demonstrations, at least in these times, would never be felt to constitute a sufficient warrant for legislative enactments to the disadvantage of Popery.

On the other hand, if every Popish bishop, priest, deacon, sub-deacon, monk, and friar in Ireland, were this day, seriously and in downright earnest, to repudiate every one of the persecuting decrees,

bulls, and canons, that have issued from the Vatican, it would not in the slightest degree diminish my zeal against Popery, nor the deep conviction impressed upon my mind that the very first duty that I owe to God and my country is, to devote myself with all the energies of my nature utterly to eradicate it from the Irish soil. I denounce Popery, not because I apprehend danger from its intolerance, but because I perceive a wide-spread degradation to result from its awfully antichristian character. I oppose it, not from respect to the persons and properties of Protestants, but in consideration of the damnation that it heaps upon the souls of its votaries; not because the third canon of the fourth Lateran council has enacted a firebrand decree, but because God Almighty has said, "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image;" because the Popish doctrine of justification by faith and works combined, or by the sacraments, dishonours Christ, drives from the soul the Holy Spirit, and hands it over to perdition. I fight the battle against Rome, not to defend Protestants, but to be an humble instrument of saving Papists; and the sentiments which I thus put forward as my own, are, as I believe, those of the great mass of the Protestants of Ireland.

Let it not be supposed for one single moment, that it is a fear of Papists, or of their intolerance, that has organised and kept alive our "Protestant Association and Reformation Society." That association contemplates, not protection against them, but conversion for them. It asserts the principle of Protestant ascendancy, not because we wish to lord it over Roman Catholics, but because we are convinced that scriptural principle makes us their superiors; and because we wish to point out to their view an eminence higher than their own, which it is our ambition to lead them to seek for the attainment of. It requires them to be put out of parliament, not because of jealousy of the privilege they enjoy, but because they are known to be unfitted for its possession; because it is felt that the spirit of religious indifference which admitted them there at first, and keeps them there still, is fast plunging the empire into infidelity, demoralisation, and death, and daily rivetting those chains which bind Roman Catholics in the thralldom of a ruinous priestcraft. We consider that to oppose them, because the bull *Cæna Domini* is directed against the life of Protestants, or the bull *Bonus Pastor* against their property; because, Maldonatus says, that "The tares should be rooted out," and Menochius swears by Maldonatus; because Dens was bigoted, or Thomas Aquinas intolerant, would be to place ourselves in something like the same category with these discreditable doctors. However, we do nothing of the sort; we assail Popery because it brings the curse of God upon its victims, lowers them in the scale of society, and steeps Ireland in wretchedness and degradation. We conceive that to oppose them on such grounds as those on which I animadvert, would be to lay ourselves open to the charge of being merely political partisans, who, on the pretence of dangers which they apprehended for themselves, were anxious to involve in political disadvantages those from whom they entertained

fears; a charge obviously groundless, if made against men, the whole object of whose labours is, to reclaim Roman Catholics from the error of their ways.

That it is the growth of religious indifferentism, that is to say, of infidelity in fact—for those are never indifferent to religion who sincerely believe it and spiritually realize its power—which has originated the present relative positions of the parties, is abundantly evident from the whole history of the constitutional, or rather, indeed, of the unconstitutional progress of Roman Catholics. This truth is illustrated by those extracts from the debate on the Maynooth Bill, which are given in the fifth chapter of the preceding Part of this work. What spiritual blindness, what total disregard of the Word of God, what utter contempt for the principles of the church, do these extracts, short as they are, display! And what are those extracts, but a fair specimen of the spirit of the Legislature—alas, we have too much reason to say, of the community in general!

I have lately had put into my hand a most interesting volume; it is entitled, “A Report of the Debates in both Houses of the Parliament of Ireland, on the Roman Catholic Bill, passed in the Session of 1792” —(Dublin, printed by H. Fitzpatrick, 1792). Previously to the time in question, Roman Catholics were not admitted to the bar; a former act had allowed them to practise as attorneys, but forbade them to take apprentices; penalties were likewise inflicted on Roman Catholics who married with Protestants, or who kept schools without the licence of the Protestant ordinary of the ecclesiastical district in which they resided. The Roman Catholic Bill in debate, and which passed unanimously, was intended to remove these particular disabilities. Not only, however, did it not propose to give Roman Catholics any share of the franchise, but the general voice of Parliament deprecated so large a concession. The debate is, indeed, a most interesting one; and clearly proves that it was not a Christian sense of the obligations of religious toleration, but a growing indifference to the verities of Protestantism which influenced the conduct of the Legislature. Sir Hercules Langrishe introduced the bill, and recommended it in a very eloquent speech, breathing just that spirit of liberalism which from that day to this has been making inroads on the constitution. I cannot think but that a few extracts from this debate will prove very interesting to my readers. They will convince them of that which it is my object to prove, namely, that unless we maintain the Roman Catholic controversy in such a way as shall primarily fix the attention of the whole Protestant community upon the anti-scriptural character of Popery, in contradistinction to its political objectionability upon its doctrinal heterodoxy, in contradistinction to its intolerant nature, little or no good will be effected. If we fail to revive a public sense of the paramount importance of Protestantism, considered as the saving system of Christianity, and to excite opposition to Popery, as utterly ruinous to the spiritual interests of its victims, we shall all beyond a doubt perish in one common ruin. Be it remembered, that the extracts

which I submit are from the speeches of men who were members of an exclusively Protestant parliament.

The Honourable Denis Browne said, he had conversed with many Roman Catholics of respectability and intelligence, not one of whom had ever objected to the principle of Protestant ascendancy; and if he thought the bill could have such a tendency, he would not vote for it. "They never contended with the Protestant interest for ascendancy; they are satisfied that you should enjoy that superiority of rights you are attached to, and that you have possessed since the reign of Elizabeth." "They tell you the land is in the hands of the Protestants; that a Protestant government and church, and your connexion with England, must preserve your ascendancy." [What a prophet!]

Mr. Michael Smith—With respect to the intermarriages of Protestants and Roman Catholics, I feel assured it is a measure that can never meet resistance within these walls; in a country eminently distinguished by the beauty of its women, and gallantry of its men, shall it be deemed criminal to admire that form, whose

——— every step is grace,
And every gesture dignity and love?

Shall it be deemed a breach of allegiance to pay homage to beauty? &c., &c. Gracious heaven! shall all their holy joys—shall all their sacred and mysterious raptures be by a merciless law converted into pains and penalties? &c., &c. I fear I have trespassed on the attention of the House too long. By passing this bill, kindness on the one hand will not, cannot fail of producing gratitude on the other—until, after a lengthened period of mutual harmony, cordiality, and affection, that happy moment so much, so devoutly to be wished for by every real friend of this country, shall arrive, when the divided names of Protestant and Roman Catholic shall be heard no more, but mellowed and melted away, shall finally lose themselves in the more endearing glories and divine appellations of—friend—brother—and fellow-christian. [A capital specimen of the inflated and infidel trash which ushered in the disasters of our country.]

Colonel Hutchinson—It appears at first not a little surprising that a difference of opinion among divines, whether a text of Scripture ought to be construed figuratively or literally, should have created such animosities. The absurdity of such a cause of contest is lost in the immensity of the mischief it has done. He may be a zealous Protestant, but he is not a zealous advocate for truth, who is unwillingly to acknowledge that the sentiments of mankind on the subject of religious differences, have materially changed. The [Roman] Catholic will forget to be a bigot as soon as the Protestant shall cease to be a persecutor. [What a wise-acre!]

The Honourable George Knex, (on the admission to the bar) says—Their prejudices it will remove by its study and practice, and their antipathies it will remove by their introduction to Protestant society. It places an object of ambition before their eyes in the bench, attainable only by conformity. By the intermarriage of Protestant and Papist, therefore, we unite them more closely to ourselves, and above all, we break that bond of union which linked them to each other, and give room for the operations of strong passions to excite them to reform. [What a strange idea this gentleman had of the inducements that should draw Roman Catholics to Protestantism!] The Protestant ascendancy is a vital principle of our constitution, interwoven in its whole frame, and essential to its existence. History, tradition, prejudice, habit, and instinct, root it in our minds; and there is as little danger that an Irish Protestant should discard it, as that an American savage should discard the principle of self-defence. [This worthy gentleman could no more conceive the idea of a modern Smith O'Brien, than he could of ascendant Popery.]

Mr. Grattan—It is necessary to remind you that the [Roman] Catholics acknowledge the same God and the same Redeemer, and differ from you only in the forms of his worship and ceremonies of his commemoration. [This "patriot" was the chief instrument in forcing on innovation. Does not such language prove him to have been at that time an infidel, or little better?] The Protestant ascendancy, I revere

it, I wish for ever to preserve it ! [He went a nice way about it !] From all this what do I conclude ? That the Protestant ascendancy in Ireland requires a new strength, and that you must find that strength in a progressive adoption of the [Roman] Catholic body. [!!!!!!]

Mr. Forbes—I shall without any reserve declare, that according to the best judgment I can form on the subject, a further extension of privilege, or an admission of the Roman Catholics to a reasonable and moderate participation in the elective franchise, could be effected without endangering the Protestant ascendancy, which I shall ever most zealously maintain. [What a head-piece !]

Mr. Graydon—With respect to the clergy of both persuasions, he did not think it would be advisable to educate them together, lest it might tend to re-excite those theological controversies and polemical disputations which had already done so much mischief in this country, and fomented so much the rancour of sectaries against each other. [A tolerably clear indication of the decay of religious feeling, made more evident, however, from the manner in which he was replied to by,]

Mr. George Ponsonby—He believed the spirit of religious controversy on the subject of mysteries was now totally exploded ; and mankind were content to read and admire the great truths of the Gospel, in the majestic simplicity of their own language, unperplexed by the mystical jargon of school theology. But if ever a Roman Catholic and a Protestant divine in this country should attempt to amuse themselves by reviving any public controversy about theological mysteries, and that he should have the honour of a seat in Parliament, he would find a way to silence them. Such subjects were now fallen into the utter contempt they deserved ; and it would be the fault of the Legislature, if ever they suffered the public mind to be agitated by any such contemptible nonsense. [!!! When such were the Senators that the times produced, it is little to be wondered at, that they should have laid the foundation for the overthrow of the church and the endowment of Popery.]

The debate was relieved by a few sturdy expressions of Protestant sentiment—for example :—

Colonel Blaquiére said—Sir, I shall ever revere, while I have breath, the constitution as settled by our glorious deliverer, William III.; and if my tongue had lost the faculty of speech, and my limbs were stretched motionless, and my whole frame sinking to dissolution, I should, I think, still struggle for this principle. If such measures as these are frequently passed in this assembly, the pillars of the House must bend, its foundation shake, and the whole fabric totter on the brink of destruction. [And yet this gentleman supported the Bill on the ground that “it would content Roman Catholics, but not introduce them to power !”]

Mr. Ruxton—Roman Catholics laboured, it was true, under certain disabilities, but they were such as ought to be imposed on men professing such religious sentiments. They enjoyed, nevertheless, liberty of conscience and protection of property equally with any other class of their fellow subjects, and could have no real grievance to lament, except that of obeying the sceptre they wished to sway.

General Cunningham—For his part, he was as clearly convinced as ever he was of any proposition in Euclid, that the consequence of extending any part of the elective franchise to the Roman Catholics, would be in a short time the establishment of a Roman Catholic parliament. In the newspapers he had read that the intention was to allow Roman Catholics to vote for members to sit in that parliament, if possessed of £20 per annum freehold property, in the same manner as Protestant 40s. freeholders. Were that the case, he would venture to affirm that we should have more Roman Catholics than Protestant voters in Ireland. The greater part of the electors of England enjoyed their franchise to the preclusion of the rest of the nation, in certain qualifications of property or corporate right. Now if such precautions were necessary as to the principle of property, were not some necessary towards the principle of mind ?

These sentiments, if not sound, at least bespoke in those who uttered them, a strong Protestant feeling, and a sense of the political disquali-

fication which Popery imposed on its victims. They were so mixed, however, with evidences of defectiveness of view in the minds of the speakers, that they were almost altogether neutralized in their effect upon the assembly to which they were addressed; indeed so inoperative were they, that they did not even lead the speakers themselves to the length of opposing by their vote those concessions which they so strongly denounced by their words.

There is appended to the last sentence in the speech of Colonel Blaquiere, as above given, a note by the editor, of so remarkable a character that I subjoin it:—

A circumstance—no less apposite than lamentable, has stamped the Colonel's words with an air of second sight; for on the very night se'nnight following, the "pillars of the House" did not only "bend," its foundation not only "shake," and "the whole building" not only "totter on the brink," but waswhelmed in the very gulph of "destruction;" for while the House was sitting in committee, fortunately with a very thin attendance of the members, and but a few persons in the gallery, about five o'clock in the evening, some ignited soot from the sheet iron funnels of the stoves in the lobby and corridor of the House, which had been frequently on fire in the course of the few nights preceding, communicated with the woodwork at the base of the great dome, which in a few minutes extended to the whole roof, and in less than an hour and a-half, the dome fell into the body of the House, and the whole of that exquisitely beautiful room, justly admired as a paragon of taste, grandeur, and elegant accommodation, by all the travellers of Europe who have seen it, was reduced to a heap of ruins. We are happy to add, that there was not superstition enough in the country to obtain for the prophetic senator the character of a wizard; nor to impute to the Roman Catholic Bill which had passed the House, the mischief of this ominous event.

It certainly seems not a little extraordinary, that those concessions which have issued in the destruction of Protestant privilege, and the virtual overthrow of the Established Church, should have been ushered in by a casualty so striking. Though those who were contemporary with the occurrence laughed at it as an augury, we who have been fated to witness, to experience, to deplore the issue to which those early concessions have come, can scarcely read the history of the fact without being struck by its appropriate character.

I think it will be admitted that these extracts strongly illustrate the position for which I am contending. They mark a shortsightedness from which we may derive much instruction. Every single one of the speakers insisted upon the absolute importance of maintaining "Protestant ascendancy." They spoke of this as being essential to the preservation of that liberty which they had derived from "the glorious Revolution of 1688;" for in these terms it was constantly reverted to. And yet, the very men so concerned for this great political object, so convinced of the injurious character of Popery, considered as a political system, indicated a total indifference to its anti-scriptural character. They did not endeavour to conceal the thorough contempt with which they regarded those differences on speculative points which divided the contending churches; and here was the gangrene that corrupted

the whole of them, the leprosy which, at length fearfully infecting the entire community, destroyed its genuine Protestant feeling, broke down its zeal, and thus gradually allowed it to be led to that precipice on the brink of which we now stand. In the distance we behold the ruin of our church, and the wide over-spreading of "the abomination that maketh desolate." What can retrieve that which we have lost? Nothing but an extensive revival of genuine scriptural Protestant feeling.

CHAPTER IV.

MARKS OF THE TRUE CHURCH.

Every man is an infidel until he is confirmed.

Confirmation is one of the most important rites of the church.

Confirmation, properly employed, is the public recognition on the part of the church of conversion unto life—of the "new birth unto righteousness"—of the realization on the part of the Christian of the stupendous operation of living faith—of the spiritual completion of the sacrament of baptism. I feel assured that the time will come, when the church will be governed by spiritually-minded bishops, and that each of these will scrutinise the candidate for confirmation with as much anxiety as he would him for orders, and refuse the seal of the church to any one who shall not be able in a manner the most distinct to testify for himself that "God is true."

I am quite sure that the state of soul which confirmation properly exercised should authenticate, frequently exists independently of confirmation; until it do exist, however—until the mind be quickened with a lively apprehension of the grand mysteries of saving truth.—until, in effect, a change take place in the individual analogous to that which I spoke of in the last chapter as having been wrought in myself, every man is an infidel. I am far from meaning a professed infidel. I am far from desiring it to be understood that there may not be a Christian profession, and a sincere one too; but a profession, however sincere, that is not sealed by the supernatural operation of the Holy Ghost, so as that the subject of it shall not be ashamed to confess the necessity for a "new light," that he shall laugh to scorn the sneers of worldly men and worldly professors on this point; yea, so as that he shall look back upon his past career, and confess himself during its whole period to have been "dead in trespasses and sins;" dark, blind, and ignorant with respect to spiritual truth—a profession, however sincere, without all this, indicates a state of existence which is merely a modification of unregenerated human nature.

Religion consists in two things, viz :

1st. What God does in man.

2nd. What man does towards God.

Now, the essential difference of true Christianity—its distinctive attribute, is the primary importance which it attaches to this first part of religion ; and the distinctive attribute of almost every false system is, that it unduly magnifies the last.

This is the case with all the varieties of Unitarianism—a principle which developed itself in our Lord's time in the sect of the Sadducees. Unitarians of all shades, within and without the church, are eloquent and zealous as to the vast importance of keeping the commandments of God, of studying the "Chapter on the Mount" and the "Book of Proverbs;" but they detest the "fanaticism" of those who are careful about speculative points, about the mysteries and the power of religion ; who occupy themselves in the study of St. Paul's Epistles, and talk of salvation by faith alone, and conversion unto life—all such they brand with the anathema of their disapprobation, considering them no better than deluded enthusiasts.

I must not, however, forget that there is the opposite extreme, too. Unquestionably there are those who fall into the other error, who despise in religion all but what they regard as its supernatural effect upon the heart, and who, while the Spirit and the new birth, &c., are ever on their lips, appear to think that reason has no place for exercise, the law no work to do, and the church no functions to fulfil. These, however, constitute a body—if, indeed, a *body*—so ignorant, inconsiderable, evanescent, and changeable ; moreover, also, so generally altogether separated from the church, that I need not dwell upon them.

The Church of England is equally removed from both extremes ; she makes the work of God in the soul of man certainly the prime consideration in religion ; she does not, however, neglect "things which accompany salvation." She makes living faith the first point ; at the same time she insists that it should be fruitful in good works ; she requires that there should be regeneration by the Holy Ghost ; but she looks also for the fruits of the Spirit, which are these, "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance." Still I consider it essentially demanded of me that I should insist upon that change which the church speaks of as being necessary for human nature, as an important reality, a substantive thing, an absolute requisite, and that I should reiterate again and again the statement with which I set out, namely, that until this change takes place, every man is, to a great extent, an infidel. It was the occurrence of this change in my mind which awakened me to a sense of the paramount authority of the Word of God ; hence I at once learned that the Bible was not a book whose views we were to discuss in the first instance in order to their adoption, should reason assure us of their rectitude ; but that it was to be regarded as a depository of unquestionable principles, its statements to be taken as demonstrated

verities which should govern human conduct, even when the wisdom of the world and its "common sense" spoke a language that was directly the opposite.

For example: human reason has in every age availed itself of the instrumentality of images as an aid to devotion, and much may be advanced that is plausible in the recommendation of them. Here, however, the Word of God interposes, and by a distinct anathema, repeated in every form of language, it pronounces any such mode of devotion an abhorrence to the Almighty. This at once satisfies the spiritually-minded Christian; he shuts out the suggestions of a carnal reason, and bows with a submission to the Word of God as implicit as he should manifest to his voice, if it audibly spoke to him from heaven.

Again, human reason seems to urge that it would be exceedingly important to impress it on the mind of men, that the pardon of past sin would be vouchsafed as the reward of subsequent obedience. Here again Holy Scripture utters its decision as an oracle; it declares that "justification is by faith alone, without the works of the law." Again, the instructed Christian submits his reason to the Word of God; not only so, but he is convinced of the truth of the principle in his innermost soul, and is prepared to testify, even in the face of death or bonds, that any principle opposed to this is, as to its source, from the devil, and as to its operation, destructive to the souls of men.

I am feelingly constrained to enforce the principle on which I am enlarging. The very first requisite, whether as it respects our own salvation, sound views of the truth, or unalterable decision with respect to error, and a determination at every hazard to be devoted to its overthrow, the very first requisite is a spiritual apprehension of vital faith for one's self. Without this there may be a knowledge of the head, or there may be the honest prejudices growing out of a well-intended education, but there will neither be power, stability, nor perseverance.

But this is not all. The change of nature which the church insists upon imparts in the general a deep conviction of the errors of Popery, and a sense of the importance of opposing that system. This general feeling, however, is not sufficiently practical in its character to guide the Christian as to the details of his work; or, (in order that I may employ a phraseology home to the subject which I have in hand,) to enable him to determine as to the details of the system of the Roman Catholic controversy. Spiritual religion indeed makes him feel that Popery is false; it enlightens him as to the character of its falsehood; it instructs him that the idolatry of that system is an abomination, that its persecuting intolerance is totally at variance with Christian charity, that its worship in an unknown tongue is inconsistent with that edification at which true religion aims, that its celibatical canons are an encroachment on Christian liberty, and so forth: he feels strongly enough that a system which has so many points of an anti-scriptural character connected with it must be highly objectionable,

and demand, on the part of every one who venerates the Word of God, the strongest opposition. But, notwithstanding all this, he perceives that his attacks on Popery are desultory in their character; he finds it hard to comprise within a brief formulary the aggregate of Romish errors, and that it is no less difficult to embrace within similar dimensions the sum of Protestant truth. He is further left undecided as to the precise extent to which he should carry his opposition; whether principle should not cause him to rest contented with the maintenance of his own people in the true faith; whether it should not limit his interference as it respects Papists to a general declaration against their errors; in effect the Christian has to know whether Scripture does not merely in general furnish him with a set of principles whereby he may ascertain that those of Rome are false, but actually mark out the steps in which he should go in order to oppose its errors. Now full information on the point assures him that the latter is the true alternative. He discovers with surprise not merely that Popish principles are false, but that they constitute a system whose character, whose whole history, in fact, from the beginning to the end, is laid before him in the Word of God: not merely does he find this, he learns that the conduct which he should employ with respect to the system is distinctly stated to him; in one word, Scripture teaches him the true mode of maintaining the Roman Catholic controversy.

I shall not easily forget a sentiment which I once heard uttered by, perhaps, the most polished writer of our times, a master-mind, a great and a distinguished genius—who would shrink, however, from this notice;—"It was the book of Revelation which made me a *Protestant*." And so it should be in every case. The Bible makes us Christians; its prophetic revelations methodise, systematise, concentrate, and direct our opposition to Rome.

Scripture reveals two churches; the true and the false, the faithful and the apostate, the Christian and the antichristian. It is as distinct on the marks of the one, as it is on those of the other. It exhibits to us the true catholic and apostolic church, in order to attract us to it; the false, anti-catholic, and apostatic church, in order to warn us against it. And the controversy is then soundly maintained, when, in close membership and identification with the former, we wage, in subordination to it, an unflinching, unwavering, consistent, and dutiful warfare against the latter.

Were I asked what passage of Scripture does, in a manner the most clear and succinct, describe the church of Christ, I should quote Acts ii. 42. For the sake of the context I will give the preceding verse, "Then they that gladly received his word, were baptized; and the same day there were added to them about three thousand souls.

"And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers."

Here we have given to us a statement of the first great increase

of the church of the apostles; they were all admitted into that church by baptism, and afterwards they continued steadfastly,

1st. In the apostles' doctrine.

2ndly. In the apostles' fellowship.

3rdly. In breaking of bread. And

4thly. In prayers.

This description involves, perhaps, everything that is essential in the attributes of the true church.

The *first* place is assigned to "doctrine"—"they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine"—they maintained, with unwavering faith, those saving principles which the apostles taught. Can we for a moment doubt as to the standard by which we should test the apostolic character of any doctrines which may be proposed for our acceptance, when we have in our hands the genuine writings and the authentic history of the acts of the apostles themselves; and these all delivered by the very inspiration of the Holy Ghost? The sacred documents to which I refer, are as amply sufficient to convince us of what was the true mind of the apostles, as absolute personal conversation with those inspired men itself would be. By the constant study of their writings, elucidated as those writings are by the other parts of Scripture, we become imbued with the same spirit which animated them. To use the expressive language of our Homilies, "We become altered and changed, and turned into that thing which we read."—*Homily on Reading the Holy Scripture, 1st Part.* Hence, we ascertain the apostles' doctrine; and when we hear anything proposed to us as possessing that character, we unhesitatingly bring it "to the word and to the testimony," and instantly conclude that if it speak not according to these, there is no truth in it.

Secondly.—The true church continues steadfastly in the apostles' "fellowship." The force of this peculiarity will be most easily apprehended, by transferring ourselves in idea to the very time of which the text speaks. The primitive Christians here spoken of continued to be the "fellows"—the associates, the companions of the apostles themselves. Though a company of men might rise up, who should teach the "apostles' doctrine," while they continued separate from the apostles' connexion, this company would not draw over to them the members of the society which the apostles formed, those who, from the outset, were their "fellows;" and this same feeling of the importance of "earnestly" maintaining "fellowship" with the apostles, would prevent the members of the apostolic body from forming separate societies themselves. They would constantly recollect the exhortation of their Master Christ to union, the touching manner in which he deprecated division. They were made acquainted with the last prayer which he uttered in the midst of the twelve;—"Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they also may be *one*, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee; that they also may be *one* in us, that the world may believe that

thou hast sent me." (John xvii. 20, 21.) Here it will be perceived that our blessed Lord viewed the union of his followers as that which should constitute a motive for the faith of the whole world. He teaches us, that viewing the oneness in heart, feeling, and conduct of his people, the readiness with which they sank the consideration of non-essential differences, for unity sake, the readiness with which they bade away from them those sectarian animosities which might divide and dissociate them—mankind would be so struck with the evidence of the heart-subduing charity of the church, that they would cordially receive, and without hesitation believe in his own divine mission. Nor did he rest content with pouring forth the prayer once: he repeats it again and again; "The glory which thou gavest me, I have given them, that they may be *one*, even as we are *one*: I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in *one*; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them as thou hast loved me." (22, 23.) All this is towards the end of his prayer, but the importance which he attached to this unity for which he prays, appears at its commencement. "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be *one* as we are." (11.) Thus does Christ himself impress on us the importance of unity; and we find the apostles constantly speaking in terms which imply that the body which they formed was one, and that separation from it was indicative of an objectionable state of mind, while at the same time connexion therewith was indicative of sound doctrine.

"He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house; neither bid him God speed, for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." (2 John ix. 11.) That is, refuse to him the privilege of "fellowship" if he have not soundness of "doctrine;" a command necessarily implying that those who were admitted to the fellowship of the church were sound in doctrine. Saint John calls his converts his "children," (3 Epistle, 4,) indicating that they were all members of one family, and constituted therefore one body; and the same blessed apostle distinctly speaks as though separation from the body of the church marked a departure from its spirit. "They went out from us, (that is, they separated from our body,) but they were not of us; (that is, they were not animated by our spirit, or governed by our principle;) for if they had been of us they would no doubt have continued with us;" (that is, had they been under the influence of our doctrine they would have cleaved to our communion.) (1 John ii. 19.) From all these passages, and numerous others of the same import, we gather that connexion with the apostolic body, the church which the apostles themselves incorporated, is a distinctive character of the true Christian, and that such apostolic formation or origin implying fellowship with the apostles, if connected with sound doctrine, is a mark of the Christian church.

When Christ, addressing his apostles at his departure from the

earth, the most solemn moment of his intercourse with them, said, "Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world"—(last words of St. Matthew's Gospel)—when he thus spoke, and thus assures us of his constant presence with his apostles to the end of time, we are forcibly constrained to endeavour to discover the community to whom this promise is made. To the apostles themselves the promise cannot be solely applicable, for they survived their Heavenly Master but a short time; it is evident, therefore, that it applies to that church which they collected, whose perpetuity was foretold, whose prevalence over the "gates of hell" was predicted, and which, about to continue to the end of the world, needed the assurance of the constant presence of its Lord and head.

The second mark, then, of the true church is apostolic fellowship.

The third mark is "breaking of bread." "They continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in *breaking of bread*;" that is to say, in the administration of the Eucharist. Perhaps I should connect with this mark the administration of the other sacrament which is mentioned in the first instance in these terms, "They that gladly received his Word were baptized." The initiatory sacrament was baptism; the disciplinary sacrament was the Lord's Supper. The one admitted members into the church, the other strengthened them and refreshed them in it. The true church, then, was distinguished by the due administration of the two holy sacraments.

The fourth mark is one which involves essential practice; the pure worship and adoration of the Most High, drawing down the divine blessing, and investing the church with spiritual holiness and power through faith, viz., "Prayer." "They continued in breaking of bread and in *prayers*." What the character of these prayers was, is abundantly discoverable in Scripture. It would be a curious investigation which might enable us to decide what is the exact number of prayers, or inspired addresses to the Almighty, which the Holy Scripture contains. Perhaps ten thousand times ten thousand, or thousands of thousands, would be the result. Certain I am, at all events, that every one of these prayers would be found addressed to God, and glorifying him alone; and that their aggregate would enable us to conclude with an infallible certainty, as to the nature of the worship and supplication which God would have his people to practise.

Here, then, are the four scriptural marks of the church of Christ conveyed to us in a single text.

Every true church holding the apostles' "doctrine," not merely as it respects matter of speculation, but precepts of righteousness, would be thus regulated by a principle that would ensure unity of mind

through the whole body; being incorporated in the apostles' connexion, or possessing their "fellowship," the whole church would be thus adorned with a crown surmounted by twelve stars; (Rev. xii. 1;) agreeing in the two great ordinances of "baptism" and "breaking of bread," each church would have a common key to admit believers to membership, or exclude faithless professors from it; and animated by the Spirit promised to abide alway with the "church, even to the end of the world," each particular ecclesiastical community would be pervaded by a spirit of "prayer," which, however it might vary in its form, would essentially agree with the worship exemplified in Scripture, and thus admit and draw towards union with it every faithful follower of Christ. Thus, then, we have, 1st, apostolicity of doctrine; 2ndly, apostolicity of connexion; 3rdly, sacramental participation; and, 4thly, the continual practice of holy prayer. Inasmuch, however, as the two last heads may be considered included under the first, as being but details of sound doctrine, the distinctive marks of the true church may be comprised under the two former: 1st, apostolical doctrine; 2nd, apostolical connexion.

The ordinary authorities of the Church of Rome pronounce the marks of the true church to be, "unity, sanctity, catholicity, and and apostolicity." Unquestionably the true church possesses these marks; but as they are not expressly set down in Scripture as the characteristics of the church, although they certainly are in the Nicene Creed, the man whose object would be to have a "Thus saith the Lord" for every statement of his, would not be likely to set them forth as the genuine scriptural marks of the church. The possession of a common apostolical doctrine, organization in a body which is in the apostolic connexion, the employment of the same holy sacraments, and the offering up spiritual worship and prayer, and all these holy practices or attributes being co-extensive with the spread of the church wherever found, mark it as "one," as "holy," as "catholic," and as "apostolic;" but inasmuch as the Church of Rome has abused every term which she employs, we should, perhaps, in such a case as this, eschew her conventional marks, and dwell upon the existence of those which God has so clearly set before us in his revealed Word. The utter discrepancy between the Church of Rome and any set of marks, whether directly or indirectly scriptural, will appear clearly evident in the sequel.

CHAPTER V.

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH HAS THE MARKS OF A TRUE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. FIRST, APOSTOLICAL DOCTRINE.

At present my object is to urge the precise conformity of the United Church of England and Ireland with those scriptural marks of the true church above set down.

FIRST, then, as it respects *doctrine*, How pure in every respect is the great national church of these islands! Were proof demanded of this, it is instantly forthcoming. We find it in her sixth Article, whose title is, "Of the sufficiency of Holy Scriptures for salvation;" and which is as follows: "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." What a glorious assurance of the doctrinal rectitude of our church does this Article convey! Here does she submit all her essential dogmas to the standard of the sanctuary, convincing us that she has herself tried them by that standard, and adopted them from her conviction of their conformity with it. Herein she recognises the importance of the text, "Beware of false prophets;" a text which, as Martin Luther well observes, throws upon every Christian the duty of considering for himself the doctrines taught him by the ministers of the church. All the exhortations which occur in the Old Testament cautioning the people against false prophets, and commanding them to bring "to the law and to the testimony" whatever these prophets might deliver, have a bearing in the same direction. When Christ says, "My sheep hear my voice; they hear not the voice of strangers, but fly from them;" when St. Paul says, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good;" and when he says again, "He that is spiritual judgeth all things"—I repeat, when Christ and his apostles, the Old Testament as well as the New, command the members of the church to judge for themselves, to examine and prove for themselves, and when our church takes up their language, and puts into the hands of her children the divinely appointed standard, she affords us the best possible security that her doctrines accord therewith; she recognises the right of private judgment, and she furnishes each individual with the rule according to which his judgment should be formed.

But she does not leave him under the supposition that she has come to no conclusion herself, that there is no living tribunal entitled to his respect, to which his judgment should at least give heed, if not defer; she informs him that she is the witness and keeper of Holy Writ; its legitimate and reasonable expounder, invested with authority to decide on non-essentials, and to pronounce in controversies of faith. (See Article xx.) Presenting him with her Creeds, her Liturgy, her Articles, her Homilies, she shows him that her judgment is formed on every important point both of religious doctrine and practice; she invites him to test such of her principles as concern his eternal salvation by the Word of Truth; and she asks him to submit to her arrangements as to matters of order, on the ground of reason and of truth. Union with her and with the Word of God in points of faith, is essential to his happiness; submission to her in minor points, on the ground of the reasonableness of so doing, will conduce to his peace. She does not, however, promulgate so vain a proposition, as that the Scripture alone should be his rule in matters of form and ceremony,

inasmuch as Scripture has left these points undecided. With respect to these points, she speaks herself, and gives well-considered reasons for everything that she advances. Those who speak against the order that she has adopted have adopted for themselves an order as conventional as her own, and they would find it quite as vain to show texts of Scripture authorising their clerks, committee-men, and trustees, their pew rents, their hymns, their classes, their leaders, &c., as she would did she attempt, which she does not, to furnish Scripture for the institution of her churchwardens, organists, sextons, and other official persons; for the express words of her Articles or Homilies, or for those countless arrangements demanded by a sense of decency and order,—in all these points she is governed by truth in every mode of its exhibition—history, righteous authority, and the footsteps of the flock as set before her in every period of its earthly pilgrimage.

In a word, the church lays before her children her public judgment on every point of doctrine and discipline; her judgment on the former she supports by the Word of God, as recorded in the sacred oracles; on the latter by truth, gathered from every source, accessible to reasonable men.

But while our church does not exclude from their due influence upon her ceremonial arrangements and ritual discipline, the authentic history for ages past of the mystical body of Christ, and truth from whatever source it may be gathered; and when she claims for herself in subordination to reasonable motives derived from such sources, the privilege of modifying for her children their forms of worship, yet does she here also submit herself to the standard of the sanctuary. Mark her own words, "The church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith: and yet it is not lawful for the church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written; neither may it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, yet, as it ought not to decree anything against the same, so, besides the same, ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation." What an admirable oracle! what a glorious document! How deep the sense of gratitude that we should realize in considering that the goodness of God did once so highly favour these islands, as that the inhabitants of both constituting a united church with the most dignified individuals, lay and clerical, belonging to their number, bishops, priests, and deacons, the king, his ministers, and his nobles, should have sealed with the national sanction so invaluable a canon of ecclesiastical rule and order! Upon the whole it is obvious that our church distinctly reverses the process of judgment laid down by the Church of Rome. The Church of Rome commands the people to judge the Scripture by her. The united Church of England and Ireland challenges the people to judge her by the Scripture. The canon of the former is in effect destructive of every standard; it absolutely nullifies the Scriptures, inasmuch as it declares that the Scripture can speak no other language than that

which is conformable to the church's usage. Thus does it abrogate the written Word of God, and open a door for all its own impositions, however monstrous they may be. The canon of the latter grows out of a spirit identical with that which breathed from the lips of all the saints from the foundation of the world:—"The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple; the statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart; the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes. More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold; sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb." (Ps. xix.) Such is the spirit of our church! She does not indeed confine the voice of God to the Scripture; TRUTH, wherever found, she regards as stamped with the divine impress, and as bearing on its front its author's name; but like its heavenly author himself, she "magnifies his Word above all his name." (See Ps. cxxxviii. 2.) Our church distinctly submits herself to the Scripture, and by authenticating that as the rule which should govern the views and the practices of all her children, she establishes a principle that must scatter error to the four winds, crush tyranny, lay or spiritual, annihilate priestcraft, yea, and king-craft, yea, and demagogue-craft—in one word, every sort of craft, humbug, nonsense, knavery, imposture, and rascality, which gathers in the corrupt nature of man, and which, unless exploded by the light and air of heaven, would ultimately make every kingdom of the earth a vast prison-house; the monarch—the gaoler; his subjects—the manacled captives; and the priests—goblin-manufacturers to frighten the people from every attempt to recover liberty.

The glorious principle of our national church above stated is the true source of spiritual unity. Did this principle pervade Christendom, it would bind together with the charities of genuine brotherhood all its component parts, and happiness would extend throughout the borders of every Christian land. There might be diversity of form, but there would be unity of soul. So enlarged would be the spirit of Catholicity, that it would produce a disregard of forms. While the Irishman at home would worship God according to the liturgical forms of his own branch of the Church Catholic, he would, when in a foreign land, without embarrassment connect himself with the branch of the Catholic Church there, and just as much enjoy the pleasantness of communion with God, as he should if at home, although his worship in both places was quite differently modified. Of course the case which I am supposing involves considerations of language, residence, and so forth, which I purposely omit to dwell upon, for they would draw me too far away from the main question under discussion. What I urge is this, that a well-informed Christian, who is superior to the obstacles which circumstances might interpose, would find no difficulty in uniting himself with the Catholic body of every land, if it were governed as our church is, by scriptural principle, although the forms of worship might be quite diverse, the liturgical services, if written, different from his own, or perhaps occasionally altogether freed from

written words. The recognition on the part of our church of the independency of distinct branches of the Church Catholic as to their arrangements of matters of form, is clearly seen in the thirty-fourth of the articles.

Of the Traditions of the Church.

It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one and utterly alike; for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's Word. Whosoever, through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly (that others may fear to do the like), as he that offendeth against the common order of the church, and hurteth the authority of the magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren.

Every particular or national church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying.

The grand principle, then, of the paramount authority of Scripture, as a rule of faith and practice, is the true source of spiritual "unity" in the church—a unity which will not allow even the semblance of division if the spirit of individuals be divested of the selfishness which would dispose them to contend about trifles, and to set up their own self-opinion in opposition to the grave decisions of the great body of their brethren.

The aforesaid principle of the paramount authority of the Scripture, implies the "sanctity" of the church equally with its "unity." The Word of God, when read in faith, possesses the attribute of its great Author; it subdues all minds to itself; men become turned into that thing which they read by faith; saved from the extravagance of enthusiasm by the wholesome influence of a living witness for the truth, which, without lording it over her children, wisely points out to them the way wherein they should go, their path is sure to be that narrow one that leadeth unto life eternal. While she makes faith the mean—nay, the sole mean of applying to the soul the medicines of the Gospel—she has numerous rites subordinate to saving faith; manifold are the modifications of its exercise. It is faith which gives a cleansing efficacy to the sacrament of baptism; it is faith which converts the blessed Eucharist into the body and blood of Christ, and enables the believer spiritually to feed thereon; it is faith which realizes the pardoning mercy of God in the absolution of the church; it is faith which gives life and power to prayer; it is faith which lifts up the heart in praise, and makes every act of the converted man which springs from it, an act of worship and obedience to the Most High. This living faith is the gift of God; it is of the operation of the Holy Ghost; it works by love; it overcomes the world; it makes "holiness to the Lord" the very element in which the Christian lives and breathes. Conspicuous are the evidences of that holiness in every feature of our church; her articles, her liturgy, her homilies constitute an embodiment of divine truth, which reflects the "Sun of Righteous-

ness" himself. The beauty of holiness shines through her modest and decent, though dignified and exalting, ritual. Here there is a mean equally removed from the repulsive baldness of a naked religion on the one hand, or the meretricious finery of anti-scriptural superstition on the other. Authority, as distinct from tyrannical usurpation, or democratical insolence; order, as distinct from delusive priestcraft, or unregulated license, constrain us to admire, in the united Church of England and Ireland, perhaps, the most favoured community in the Christian world; and may we not properly recognise as the result of all this, the important fact, that our church and nation have been, in the latter ages, the bulwark of Christianity; the source of liberty; the fountain of light and knowledge to mankind?

With invincible power, then, may we vindicate for our church the attributes of unity and sanctity. If her children have been inconsistent; if worldly-mindedness have usurped in their breasts the place of Christian charity; if her shepherds have too often valued the flock rather for the fleece which enriched themselves, than as the inheritance which should have been made to redound to its Master's glory; if faction have drawn multitudes into parties heterogeneous and discordant; if the State, which should have been the "nursing mother of the church," employing her holy influences for the regeneration of the people, have bartered her offices to undeservers in order to promote the crooked policy of statesmen or to prevent the sounding forth of that testimony, which, while it witnessed against "the world, the flesh, and the devil," would condemn themselves—far be it from the mind of the candid inquirer to hold the church as responsible for the depravity of her sons. They sinned against their parent—they disregarded her voice—they trampled upon her testimonies; thank heaven they have neither destroyed her vitality, nor nullified within her that recuperative power with which she is even now struggling to erect herself from a prostrate condition, and to purge off those foul disorders which, indeed, impeded her usefulness, but did not seriously endanger her existence.

CHAPTER VI.

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH HAS THE MARKS OF A TRUE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.
SECONDLY, APOSTOLICAL CONNEXION.

I COME, secondly, to consider the attribute of apostolicity as a characteristic of our church—the possession on her part of that "apostolic fellowship" which Scripture points out as a mark of the true church. This she proves that she possesses from the one single source whereby the fact admits of demonstration. She shows that

she is governed by bishops duly deriving their authority from apostolic times.

That the apostles governed the primitive church is a truth which never has been brought into dispute.

Scripture presents to our view at least two primitive churches, as to the construction of which it affords us the most abundant information. I mean the Church of Ephesus and that of Crete. The Church at Ephesus was formed by St. Paul, who preached in that city and neighbourhood for two years; (Acts xix. 10;) and through his instrumentality "the Word of God grew mightily and prevailed." (v. 20.) Here there was a very large city, in which and its neighbourhood multitudes were obedient to the faith. Now there were in Ephesus many congregations, (Acts xx. 28,) and yet the whole together is called the church that was at Ephesus. (v. 17.) After St. Paul had completed his work in that city, he committed his authority to Timothy, who was ordained the first Bishop of the Church of the Ephesians. (See subscription, 2 Timothy.)

But let us hear what were the duties assigned to this primitive bishop.

1. He had charge over the teachers of religion; he was to take care that they taught sound doctrine, and to restrain them if they did otherwise. (1 Tim. i. 3.)

2. He was to hear any accusations which might be brought against them; to examine witnesses, and to give his decision accordingly. (Chap. v. 19.)

3. He was to rebuke, publicly and authoritatively, whoever of them might offend, in order to deter others from misconduct. (v. 20.)

4. He was to ordain the ministers of the church by laying on of hands, and to decide as to the qualification of candidates. (v. 22.) But besides these authoritative acts he was also himself to "preach the word, to be instant in season and out of season," in the great business of saving the souls of men. (2 Tim. iv. 2.)

The church of Crete was in like manner committed to the episcopal charge of Titus; and with respect to the regulation of everything within these two churches, we find St. Paul addressing their respective bishops. To these apostolic men he gives all his directions for the management of the churches committed to their care. He does not write to the churches themselves, as though the regulation of these matters were to be decided by them in aggregate or committee meetings; but his instructions are to the individuals whom he himself had invested with authority—a circumstance which never would have had place had the democratical, rather than the episcopal, principle been recognised as the sound one. When his epistles had the character of sermons, illustrative of faith or doctrine, calculated to correct prevalent errors or inculcate just sentiment, he addressed the communities in general; but when the government of the bodies was concerned, his epistles were addressed to the individuals appointed to carry it on. In effect, to use the words of the excellent Bishop Wilson, "Timothy and Titus had an authority committed to them for presiding over the other

ministers of Ephesus and Crete; for ordaining presbyters or elders in every city as he had appointed them; for charging some that they should preach no other doctrine than that of the apostles; for setting in order the things that were wanting; for deciding matters of controversy; for receiving accusations and exercising jurisdiction; for rebuking heretics; for appointing maintenance; for regulating the public prayers of the church; for repressing the intrusion of women as teachers; and for watching and overseeing generally the flocks and the ministers of them—are facts as little to be doubted as any which are to be deduced from the apostolic writings. The inequality of station and authority in ministers is thus apparent from the very beginning of the Gospel dispensation, as it ran through the Mosaical, and as it pervades, in fact, and ever has pervaded, all civil and domestic polity and government.”

It may be taken then as proved, that the primitive form of church government was episcopal. As the bishop of each district fell, the neighbouring bishops ordained another to succeed him. The first would have been appointed by the apostles themselves, the next would succeed to him, the next to him, and so forth; and thus would the episcopal authority be regularly handed down from the apostolic age to our own.

Let it be understood that it is the *principle* of episcopacy which enables us to argue, without any hesitation, as to the apostolicity of a genuine episcopal church; to conclude beyond a doubt that such a church possesses the attribute of apostolical connexion. The episcopal principle is the superiority of a distinct order of ecclesiastical officers who stand related to the church of the present day as the apostles did to the primitive church. They govern it generally; they confer upon its ministers their mission; they determine the position of those ministers, and as each of their own order departs, they consecrate one to occupy his place.

The mere principle here described is of such a character that, if it be true, it will enable us to ascertain beyond a possibility of doubt that the body to which we belong was organised, incorporated, formed, associated, and constructed into a society by the apostles themselves, and therefore has “continued in their fellowship,” or else that it has duly grown as a branch from such an apostolic society.

That which the apostolicity of the church implies is this, that it is neither a separating community, nor a self-constituted one.

Christ did not come into the world to preach a system of doctrine—imbue a great number of people with his views—then gather together his sermons in volumes—compose a biography of himself, through which the actions of his life might be seen to be illustrative of his principles; and when he was about to die, gather together the multitude of his followers, present them with the volumes which comprised his life and writings, and declare that any individual who embraced

these his doctrines, and followed this his example, would become a member of his church, and that any number of such members coming together might form a society and choose a minister for themselves; warning them at the same time, that these societies should be quite independent of one another, and that it would be improper that any one of them should trammel any other by any pledge that would involve agreement in practice, or any sort of connexion at all as holding them together—he did nothing of the kind. I can easily conceive that he might have done thus, and, peradventure, if I chose to be governed by what they call “common sense”—which is frequently either no sense at all, or very bad sense—I could persuade myself, and give arguments and reasonings, syllogisms and enthymemes to others, in great abundance, to prove that this would have been the wisest course; nay, I might go further—having persuaded myself that it was the wisest course, having found a great many inconveniences connected with the order of bishops, and having flattered myself into the notion that I myself was much better qualified to govern a congregation by my own superior wisdom, than I should be if obliged to conform to the will of an order of men possessing rank superior to my own; I might then take the Bible in my hand, and by the twisting of one text, and the wresting of another, and the disregard of a third, and a fixed determination to treat all history as though it were a dead letter, I might either satisfy my conscience, or stifle it to such a degree, as that I might be able to stand up and say that what Christ did was just equivalent to that which I have above alleged that he did not do; and I might persuade a great many, or at least, as many as would put bread in my mouth, that my notions were quite scriptural, and that by choosing me as their minister they would enjoy a great deal more independence of control themselves, than if they continued to belong to the church; nay, not only so, but that they might attain to the possession of ecclesiastical rule, whereas, under the episcopal system, they could do nothing more than occupy the position of the governed. I say, I might do all this, and, peradventure, after all, enjoy the reputation of a very pious, ingenious, and learned man; but, at the same time, I should be a great knave if I did it. No; Christ did not write a book, and state that whoever believed it, however they might be led to the belief of it, would constitute his people and the aggregate of the societies which they might form, his churches; but he did something totally and altogether different; he formed an Association which he called his church, under the government of a few leaders, whom he called his apostles; he commissioned them to spread the principles which he taught, and to increase the body that he formed, until it should pervade the whole earth, and at last gather into one single family, possessing one single mind, and all bound together in a holy and regulated “fellowship,” all the children of men. This is what he did.

The principle of episcopacy makes manifest the antiquity of the body—the church. Visible at the present day, it towers heavenwards, till lost amid the brightness of inaccessible glory, its head is Christ himself.

The episcopal principle being taken as proved, it follows that the church will be able to trace back through the vista of time the successive occupants of distinct sees to the very period when they were established. The ability to do this arises from the eminence of the individuals referred to. In general they have played a distinguished part in the history of their times, and written their names upon its pages. But even though their names should not be known, though, through a long space of time, these may have sunk into oblivion, or have become wrapt in obscurity, through the confusion prevalent in the ages when the bishops lived; this does not break the chain of succession, nor prevent us from concluding, as the episcopal principle warrants us to do, that that succession has flowed down uninvalidated.

We do not infer sacramental virtue in our ordinances, in consequence of apostolic succession in the church; we feel convinced that spiritual grace to individual Christians can only be apprehended through living faith in themselves. We simply regard that succession as a warrant for the apostolicity of our church, inasmuch as it is a necessary consequence therefrom; and in viewing a line of prelates coming down from the time of the apostles themselves to our own day, we regard that line, not as exhibiting the links in the chain of apostolical succession, but as an additional evidence that these links are whole and complete. If there were not on record the name of one single bishop above or beyond the existing one, the very nature of episcopacy would still assure us that there was, in fact, a line of them reaching back to the apostles' days. I repeat, then, it is the episcopal *principle* which assures us of the existence of an apostolical chain of succession reaching from the earliest days, and not any list of names whatever. When, indeed, a list of names can be adduced, it illustrates and corroborates the truth, but does not add anything to its demonstration, which, as I said before, follows from the very nature of episcopacy.

Having said so much in explanation of the point which I am urging, I would lay before my readers the actual occupants of one single see in the Irish church, from the time of the conversion of our nation to the present date.

I will take the archdiocese of Armagh, merely stating that I derive my information from one of the most respectable and careful of those writers who have devoted themselves to the task of putting on record the history of Irish affairs, the Right Honourable Sir James Ware. He was a privy councillor in the reign of Charles II., and died shortly before the Glorious Revolution under King William.

1. ST. PATRICK,

Was the first archbishop of Armagh. He arrived in this country consecrated to the work of a missionary, as some say, by Celestin, Bishop of Rome; but according to others, Lupus and Germanus, who were French bishops, consecrated our Irish apostle. He obtained from one Daire, a person of great affluence and high character, a valu-

able site of ground, and built on it a church, in the year A.D., 445, or according to the annals of Ulster, 444. This became his cathedral church, and originated the importance of the city of Armagh. He was succeeded by

2. BINEN, in Latin, BENIGNUS.—(A.D. 445, resigned 465.)

He was the son of a distinguished man of wealth and power, who lived in Meath, hospitably received Saint Patrick, and was, with his whole family, converted by him. This bishop resigned the see, and died three years afterwards. The third in succession was

3. JARLATH.—(Succ. 465, died 482.)

The intimate and dear friend of his predecessor, he had his education under St. Patrick.

4. CORMAC.—(Succ. 482, died 497.)

He had been made by St. Patrick, Bishop of Trim, and was of the royal family of Meath. The aged saint lived to transfer him to the more important charge of Armagh. It is said that he was an example of innocency of life, piety, learning, and the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures.

5. DUBTACH I.—(Succ. 497, died 513.)

His name would be pronounced Duffy, if modernised. He is recorded in history in terms which bespeak the possession of much real worth.

6. AILILD I.—(Succ. 513, died 526.)

He was of the blood royal of Ulster; a convert of St. Patrick; and a married man at the time of his conversion. The 6th Canon of the Synod held by St. Patrick, A.D., 448, enacted, that "the wife of a priest should appear abroad veiled."

7. AILILD II.—(Succ. 526, died 536.)

He was of the same distinguished family as his predecessor, and died on the 1st of July, in the above year, after sitting ten years.

8. DUBTACH II.—(Succ. 536, died 548.)

This prelate was also of royal blood.

9. DAVID, [MAC GUAIRE].—(Succ. 548, died 551.)

Colgan, a writer of some authority in these matters, says, that this David is the same person whom the "Psalter of Cashel" calls O'Fiachra.

10. FEIDLEMID, [FIN].—(Succ. 551, died 578.)

Otherwise, Phelim Finn. He would seem to have been a person of distinguished talent.

11. CAIRLAN.—(Succ. 578, died 588.)

He was a native of the county of Meath. In these days his name would be written Carolan. He died on the 24th of March. By all accounts he was a worthy prelate.

12. EOCHAD, [MAC DERMOD.]—(Succ. 588, died 598.)

He was also called Abbot of Armagh, as a few of his predecessors had been.

13. SENACH.—(Succ. 598, died 610.)

Archbishop Ussher makes him the last of a third order of holy bishops in Ireland, who were dignified by the name of "saints." The first order was called *sanctissimos*, or "very great saints;" the second order, *sanctiores*, or "greater saints;" the third, *sanctos*, or "saints," of which the last, as aforesaid, was Bishop Senach.

14. MAC-LAISIR.—(Succ. 610, died 623.)

During his episcopate the church was enormously agitated on the subject of the proper day for celebrating Easter. We may be quite certain that when it turned aside to such disputes, there was a prevalent decay of true faith. A discussion took place on the subject in England, in which the Archbishop of Canterbury took a leading part. There is some reason to think that Mac-Laisir was present, as it is mentioned that "the Archbishop of Ireland" was convinced by the reasonings of St. Lawrence, the Archbishop of Canterbury above-mentioned.

15. THOMIAN, [MAC RONAN.]—(Succ. 623, died 661.)

He was of noble birth, distinguished for his learning and virtues; his fame spread abroad, and reached even to Rome itself. An important epistle addressed to him is extant in the ecclesiastical history of the venerable Bede.—*Liber ii., chap. 19.*

16. SEGENE.—(Succ. 661, died 688.)

Armagh twice suffered by fire during this prelate's time; in 670 and 687.

17. FLAN-FEBLA —(Succ. 688, died 715.)

Flan, (or Florence,) surnamed Febla, sat like his predecessor, 27 years. A synod in which forty prelates, (abbots and bishops) assisted, was held in his time.

18. SUIBHNEY.—(Succ. 715, died 730.)

Or, as we should pronounce the name, Sweeney, was the next in succession. During his time, Flahertach (or Flaherty,) king of

Ireland, embraced a monastic life at Armagh. The principles of apostasy were now strongly at work.

19. CONGUSA.—(Succ. 730, died 750.)

“He wrote a poem, exhorting Allan, king of Ireland (whose confessor he had been), to revenge the crime of sacrilege committed by Rooney, king of Ulster, who had pillaged some churches in the diocese of Armagh.” So writes Colgan; and if truly, we may be sure that Bishop Congusa had very far departed from the principles of his master.

20. CELE-PETER.—(Succ. 750, died 758.)

This extraordinary name is equivalent to *Petricola*, which means a venerator of Peter. The man seems more remarkable for the strangeness of his name, about which much discussion is on record, than for the episcopal qualities which adorned him.

21. FERDACHRY.—(Succ. 758, died 768.)

He sat about ten years, and died in the month of May.

22. FOENDELACH.—(Succ. 768, resigned 771.)

Ecclesiastical disputes disgusted him with his office, and led him to retire from it. He would now be called Finlay.

23. DUBDALETHY I.—(Succ. 778, died 793.)

Sir James Ware attributes certain difficulties about the dates at this time to prevailing broils, evidently characteristic of an age of darkness.

24. AFFIAT.—(Succ. 793, died 794.)

He struggled, perhaps with great anxiety, to obtain an honour so much sought after. Anxious, however, as he was for the pall, he did not wish that it should be accompanied with the winding sheet. By the way, I may add that palls, as a mark of the archiepiscopal dignity, were not introduced into this country until about 300 years after this; at which period Paparo, the Pope's legate, was allowed to make them a badge of submission to the see of Rome.

25. CUDINISCUS.—(Succ. 794, died 798.)

He sat four years.

26. CONMACH.—(Succ. 798, died 807.)

It is probable that this name was pronounced Conway. He died suddenly.

27. TORBACH, [MAC-GORMAN.].—(Succ. 807, died 808.)

He is called a scribe, which would imply, perhaps, that he was an author: if so, his works have not reached us.

28. NUAD, [MAC-SEGENE.](—(Succ. 808, died 812.)

It would appear that this prelate was a great devotee; he was anxious, however, to reform some abuses in the church.

29. FLANGUSS, [MAC LOINGLE.](—(Succ. 812, died 822.)

His episcopate may pass without particular notice.

30. ARTRIGIUS.—(Succ. 822, died 833.)

This prelate confirmed the primacy of Armagh over all Ireland, by visiting in his official capacity the other provinces. He presided in very tumultuous times, caused by the inroads of the Danes. It is said that these northern invaders in his time held Armagh in possession for the space of a month.

31. EUGENE, [MONASTER.](—(Succ. 833, died 834.)

It is little wonder that those troublous times should have left us brief memorials of the prelates who presided in them.

32. FARANAN.—(Succ. 834, resigned 848.)

Turgesius the Norwegian drove him from his see, and expelled the students from the college of Armagh. While the Norwegians and the Danes were pillaging the city, Dermot O'Tigernach, (or Tierney,) was endeavouring to wrest the see from Faranan. The latter abdicated in 848, to make room for his rival, and died four years after.

33. DERMOD, [O'TIGERNACH.](—(Succ. 848, died 852.)

He was pronounced by his cotemporaries the wisest of all the doctors of Europe. It is said that the ravages of the Danes in Armagh so afflicted him, that they hastened his end. He died in the same year as the man he had supplanted.

34. FACTNA.—(Succ. 852, died 874.)

He was called "Bishop of Armagh, Heir of St. Patrick, and Head of the Religion of all Ireland." In his time Armagh was laid waste by Amlaf, the Norwegian, A.D. 869.

35. AINMIRE.—(Succ. 874, died 875.)

He held the see but nine months.

36. CATASACH I., [MAC-RABARTACH.](—(Succ. 875, died 883.)

In English, Casey M'Rafferty, called "Prince of Armagh." St. Augustine, in his Commentary on the 44th Psalm, tells us, that at a very early age bishops were called "*ecclesiæ principes*."

37. MAELCOB, [MAC CRUM-WAIL.]—(Succ. 883, died 885.)

Ireland was not without its Cromwells, long before Oliver rode roughshod over her plains. Perhaps it would be consolatory to some of our aspirants after nationality, if they could flatter themselves that it was the fire of Celtic fraternity which furnished the English Cromwell with such powers of "agitation."

38. MAEL-BRIGID, [MAC DORNAN.]—(Succ. 885, died 927.)

He was the thirteenth in descent from "King Neill the great," and therefore, of the blood royal of Ireland. He seems to have been a high-minded and able man.

39. JOSEPH.—(Succ. 927, died 936.)

He was a self-denying and a learned prelate, and died at an advanced age. The Danes in his time also plundered Armagh.

40. MAEL PATRICK, [MAC MAOLTULE.]—(Succ. 936, died same year.)

He sat only five months.

41. CATASACH II., [MAC DULGEN.]—(Succ. 937, died 957.)

Again Armagh was plundered by the Danes, (A.D. 941,) who slew in battle Murtagh, Prince of Ailech, son of Neill, King of Ireland.

42. MUREDACH, [MAC FERGUS.]—(Succ. 957, deposed 966.)

Why he was deposed does not appear. The deposition of bishops seems to have fallen into disuse; were it revived, it might not even in the 19th century lack occasion for its employment.

43. DUBDALETHY II., [MAC KELLACH.]—(Succ. 966, died 998.)

Three years before his death Armagh was wasted by accidental fire.

44. MURECHAN.—(Succ. 998, resigned 1001.)

Murechan, or Muregan, or Morgan, resigned the third year after his accession, but why, or wherefore, does not appear.

45. MAEL MURY, or MARIAN.—(Succ. 1001 died 1021.)

He is called in the "Annals of the Four Masters," "a most wise and learned doctor;" during this prelate's time, Brian Boru, (perhaps the modern Borough,) the renowned monarch of Ireland, and the ancestor of Mr. Smith O'Brien, was slain at the Battle of Clontarf, A.D. 1014. His body was conveyed to Armagh and buried there, though some say that he was buried at Kilmainham.

46. AMALGAID.—(Succ. 1021, died 1050.)

By the way, Bishop Maelmurry, (or Malmurry,) is stated to have been the father of Dubdalethy the 3rd, while Amalgaid was the father of Archbishops Maelisa, and Donald. If this enable us Protestants to exclaim against the celibatical injunctions of Popery, it will afford Papists no less occasion to raise their voice against the nepotism that is too often the disgrace of our church:

47. DUBDALETHY III.—(Succ. 1050, died 1065.)

This bishop was an historian; he wrote a history of Ireland, and memoirs of the archbishops of Armagh, neither of which have survived to our times. Hugh O'Forrey is also mentioned as Archbishop of Armagh at this time, and his death as prior to that of Dubdalethy; no doubt he was the suffragan, or coadjutor of that prelate.

48. CUMASACH, [O'HERUDEN.]—(Succ. 1065, resigned same year.)

The annals give us no information as to the cause of his sudden retirement.

49. MAELISA, [MAC AMALGAID.]—(Succ. 1065, died 1092.)

Son of the 46th in the list. In his time Armagh was consumed by fire. All the churches, their bells, furniture, &c., perished in the flames.

50. DONALD, [MAC AMALGAID.]—(Succ. 1092, died 1106.)

A few days after his brother's death he succeeded him in his see; he was a highly honoured character, and devoted himself to the reconciliation of the contending dynasties of his country. He enjoyed the friendship and respect of Lanfrank, Archbishop of Canterbury, and of Anselm, Lanfrank's successor. Epistles from these two distinguished prelates to Archbishop Donald were published by Archbishop Ussher, and are still extant.

51. CELSUS, [MAC-AID MAC-MAELISA.]—(Succ. 1106, died 1129.)

This archbishop was a highly popular and learned character. Armagh, in his time also, was consumed by fire. These frequent fires which happened at Armagh prove the meanness of the buildings at that age. Slate houses were almost unknown, if not altogether so; and yet it is on this age of mud edifices covered with straw that "Young Ireland" loves to indulge its disposition for romance. The uncivilised denizens of the Irish wigwams, it pictures out as enlightened patriots, and mourns the degeneracy of a Protestant age of steam and railroads. However, Archbishop Celsus, or, as some write it, Cellach (which we should pronounce Kelly), was a respectable prelate, and after the misfortune that happened to his city, he spent the

greatest part of his life in reconciling differences among the princes and great men of the kingdom; that is to say, in endeavouring to prevent them from cutting one another's throats.

52. MAURICE, [MAC-DONALD.]—(Succ. 1129, died 1134.)

This individual was of the same family with his predecessor; in fact, history gives us to understand that during this dark age the principal spiritual personage was generally a coadjutor bishop, or suffragan, who fulfilled the episcopal functions, while the nominal occupant of the chair considered himself as entitled to enjoy, without ecclesiastical anxieties, those temporal advantages which it afforded, himself being little different from a layman. I think it well to state this—a fact that must be very humbling to the Tractarian high churchman, and afford a monstrous puzzle to any one who would derive sacramental virtue from apostolical mission; it will, by no means, however, embarrass those who take the view of the subject which I would inculcate, and which, I am convinced, is the true one—namely, that it is the episcopal *principle* which is our true warrant for inferring an apostolical connexion in our church, and that a list of names is merely an illustration of the subject.

53. MALACHY O'MORGAIR.—(Succ. 1134, resigned 1137.)

The history gives us a sad picture of the Irish Church in those days. The usurping propensities of princes, and the weakness, which is a constant accompaniment of defective views of Christian truth, wrought together to render the church despised. Perhaps it was a consideration of abounding disorder that induced this prelate to think that even submission to Roman tyranny was a lesser evil than the miseries which flowed from dominant faction at home. However this may be, he took a journey to Rome to solicit the pall from the Pope. It is said that "his holiness" took off his mitre and put it on the head of Malachy, as a token of the reverence he bore him; he also made him a present of some of the vestments which he wore himself, and dismissed him with "the kiss of peace," and "apostolical benediction." The pall is a hood of lambskin, or some other skin, which the Pope gives to his archbishops. By the reception of this they acknowledge his supremacy, and without it they consider that they would be no better than heathen men and publicans. The Pope, of course, solely intends that its use should promote the good of souls, although there is no manner of doubt that it brings store of Peter's pence to the Vatican. "His holiness" made Malachy his legate in Ireland, an office, the duties of which the then occupant, Gilbert, Bishop of Limerick, was too much advanced in age to execute with vigour; but as to the palls, he told him, that in a matter of such great importance the sanction of an Irish council would be desirable. That he might more effectually exercise his legantine functions, Malachy resigned his see of Armagh, and called synods of the clergy in all parts of Ire-

land. It is easy enough to conjecture the tendency which their deliberations took.

54. GELASIUS, [MAC-RODERICK.](—(Succ. 1137, died 1174.)

He had been Abbott of Derry, succeeded on the resignation of Malachy, and held a synod in Holm-Patrick, attended by fifteen bishops and two hundred priests. This synod, in conjunction with the archbishop agreed to send his predecessor, Malachy, now the Pope's legate, on a mission to Rome to get palls. He died on the journey. However, Cardinal Paparo shortly after, in 1152, arrived in Ireland, bringing with him four palls from the reigning Pope Eugene, for the four archbishops—viz., Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam. He distributed the palls in a great synod held at Kells. Gelasius was subsequently very active in visiting all parts of the island, and in reconciling the differences of the provincial kings. He has a high character amongst Irish annalists for capacity, wisdom, learning, benevolence, and hospitality.

55. CORNELIUS, [MAC-CONCALEDE.](—(Succ. 1174, died 1175.)

King Henry II. had arrived in Ireland during the prelacy of Gelasius. British influence may therefore be henceforth regarded as powerfully operative in the affairs of the church in this country, and that influence was entirely devoted, at least at first, to the cause of the Pope. Cornelius only sat one year. He died at Rome, whither he had gone to procure the pall.

56. GILBERT, [O'CARAN.](—(Succ. 1175, died 1180.)

Was translated from the bishopric of Raphoe to the primatial see. A short time before his death, the cathedral, the abbey of St. Peter and St. Paul, two nunneries, and a great part of Armagh were consumed by fire. From the very earliest period of the history of the Irish church, we find that it was infected with the monastic spirit—a spirit necessarily the result of incorrect views on the doctrine of justification. Indeed, this spirit pervaded the whole world—eastern as well as western; and speedily gave rise to multiplied errors. I have not the slightest possible doubt that if the Tractarianism of our day, which developed itself at first in scarcely any other manner than the hyper-exaltation of the sacraments—the deduction of justification from one, and of sanctification from the other, had been allowed to proceed uninterruptedly, it would gradually have produced monasticism, saint worship, relic veneration, with that of images, and pictures, purgatory, transubstantiation, and all the rest; and if the Pope of Rome had no existence, it would at length have constructed a Pope for itself, or have found one, but too ready to occupy the place of tyrant-in-chief over all those corrupted by the errors in question. Such, no doubt, was the case with the church of our country.

57. MAELISA, [O'CARROL.]—(Succ. 1184, died same year.)

He was transferred from Clogher, and died on his journey to Rome, in the year of his translation.

58. AMLAVE, [O'MURID.]—(Succ. 1184, died 1185.)

Though he enjoyed the see but one year, history has recorded him as a shining light, illuminating both clergy and people. He was interred in Derry.

59. THOMAS O'CONNOR.—(Succ. 1185, died 1201.)

It is rather remarkable that O'Connor had been appointed to the see after the death of Gilbert (O'Caran) ruled it for four years, and then, wearied with the tumults of a time of war and anxious for repose, resigned it to O'Carroll, Bishop of Clogher; after his death, however, he re-entered on the see, and governed it sixteen years. It is stated that he was "a man of religious life and great learning, and that, at his instance, Jocelyn undertook to write the Life of St. Patrick." On this subject I will venture to remark, that if Jocelyn's "History" pleased its patron, he must have been one of the weakest and most credulous of men.

60. EUGENE, [MAC-GILLIVIDER.]—(Succ. 1206, died 1216.)

On the death of Archbishop O'Connor, Simon Rochfort, Bishop of Meath; Ralph le Petit, Archdeacon of Meath; Humphrey Tickhull and the above Eugene were competitors for the see. King John was for Tickhull, and the Pope for Mac-Gillivider, and after a dispute of some years, at the end of which Tickhull died, the Pope's nominee gained the prize, with the acquiescence at length of the King himself. Eugene afterwards went to Rome, where he assisted at the general council of the Lateran, and died. He is said to have been an honest and a virtuous man.

61. LUKE NETTERVILLE.—(Succ. 1220, died 1227.)

He was elected by the Dean and Chapter of Armagh on the death of the preceding prelate, but King Henry III. refused to confirm the election, because it was made without his licence. At last the King granted a licence to the chapter to go to election; Netterville was re-elected, and was consecrated by Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury. He returned to Ireland on the 4th of October, 1220, founded a Dominican monastery at Drogheda, and died on the 17th of April, 1227.

62. DONAT O'FIDABRA.—(Succ. 1227, died 1237.)

This bishop was translated from Clogher. Pope Gregory IX. endeavoured to obtain the see for one Nicholas, a Canon of Armagh,

who was unanimously elected by the chapter, confirmed by the Pope, and consecrated by an Italian bishop. Donat, however, was in full possession with the King's consent, and it was not thought proper to displace him. He died in England on his return from Rome. Query—Was it Rome that introduced into Ireland the inveterate habit of absenteeism?

63. ALBERT, of COLOGN.—(Succ. 1240, resigned 1247.)

The see was vacant three years after the death of Donat. King Henry III. was anxious to obtain it for Robert Archer, a Dominican friar; but the successful candidate was Albert, of Cologn. He was a high-spirited prelate, and zealous, naturally enough, for the Pope. He resigned in 1247, and died abroad.

64. REINER.—(Succ. 1247, died 1256.)

The King had heard that the Pope designed to dispose of the archbishopric by provision; that is, as I suppose, of the "next presentation," and he determined to be beforehand with "his Holiness," so that his (the King's) nominee should be ready to step in on the death of Albert. The latter, however, obtained royal licence to visit Rome, and while there, he resigned. Reiner was elected, consecrated, and in possession before the King heard of the vacancy. Had his name been *Reynard*, it would not have been inappropriate.

65. ABRAHAM O'CONNELLAN.—(Succ. 1257, died 1260.)

Almost the whole period of his short episcopate was spent in journeying to Rome, and in residence there.

66. PATRICK O'SCANLAIN.—(Succ. 1261, died 1270.)

This prelate held a great synod at Drogheda, in which the primatial right of Armagh over all Ireland was firmly established. This assembly was graced by the presence of the Lord Justice and several of the principal men of the kingdom. Pope Urban IV., by a bull dated November, 1263, confirmed the dignity of the primacy of all Ireland to this see. The following are the words of the bull: "After the example of Pope Celestine, our predecessor, we, by our apostolic authority, confirm to you and to your successors the primacy of all Ireland, which title, it is well known, your predecessors have held firm and unshaken to this time; decreeing, that all the archbishops and bishops of Ireland and other prelates thereof shall at all times pay to you and your successors all obedience and reverence as to their primate."

67. NICHOLAS MAC-MOLISSA.—(Succ. 1272, died 1303.)

He was an inveterate enemy to such Englishmen as were preferred to bishoprics in this kingdom, and laid them under all the difficulties

in his power. In order that the excommunicatory power of the bishops might be more stringent, he induced them all to enter into a covenant that each would execute the sentence of the other, so as that excommunicated persons should find no place of rest in the island. This agreement was executed at Trim on the Sunday after St. Matthew's day, 1291, and received the sanction of the Pope. No doubt it was promoted by him. How effectually it was calculated to reduce the royal power is obvious. The archbishop was an extensive benefactor to his see, and an unwearied opponent of the British power in Ireland. The O'Connell of the 13th century had a warm friend within the palace of Armagh.

68. JOHN TAAF.—(Succ. 1305, died 1306.)

The see was vacant nearly three years after the death of Primate Nicholas. One Michael, a Franciscan friar, was elected, and received the royal assent; but as he was never consecrated, he is not enumerated among the archbishops. Afterwards Taaf was consecrated; but he died at Rome; and though he wore the mitre he never saw his see.

69. WALTER DE JORSE.—(Succ. 1306, resigned 1311.)

He was a Dominican friar, and brother to Thomas Jorse, Cardinal of St. Sabina, and was consecrated by Nicholas, Cardinal of Ostium, as appears by a bull of Pope Clement V., which is extant amongst the records of the Tower of London. This bull contained some clauses derogatory to the crown. As accessory to these clauses a fine of 1000*l.* was imposed on the archbishop, but he died before it was levied. It was the Pope's usurpations which led to the disputes between the king and the prelates. The king held in his hands the temporalities, and the Pope held the pall; unpossessed of the former, the primate was left without the fleece, and of the latter, without the command of the flock. The king, therefore, and the Pope considered each that he had in his hand a sufficient key to the see, and there was accordingly a constant wrangling between the parties as to which of them should succeed in promoting his own creature. Through the co-operation of the clergy, the Pope, in general, had the best of the fight.

70. ROLAND JORSE.—(Succ. 1331, resigned 1321.)

He was the last primate's brother, and was consecrated abroad. During this prelate's government, his see was impoverished by the ravages of Bruce and his Scots; the consequence of which was, that the archbishop was unable to pay to the Pope the fees of his promotion. Hence, he was excommunicated by "his holiness;" the king, however, interfered to get him a long day, but it appears that the archbishop, unable to get clear of his embarrassments, in order to escape being dunned by the Pope, resigned his preferment.

71. STEPHEN SEGRAVE.—(Succ. 1322, died 1333.)

He was rector of Stepney, near London, Dean of Lichfield, and, previously, Chancellor of the University of Cambridge. He was also of noble birth. He was promoted by the crown, and commended to the Pope, John XXII., by special letters from King Edward III., in which he was commended for high birth, virtue, learning, and eminent pastoral qualities.

72. DAVID O'HIRAGHTY.—(Succ. 1334, died 1346.)

He was consecrated in France, and summoned to a parliament held in Dublin, 1337, under Sir John Charleton, Lord Justice of Ireland. He maintained a strong controversy against the Archbishop of Dublin, who was anxious to assert against him (Armagh) the primatial right of the see of Dublin. This dispute ran high for hundreds of years, and was settled by a sort of compromise, which called Dublin the primate of Ireland, and Armagh the primate of all Ireland. There can be no doubt but that, in very early ages, Armagh possessed a right of ecclesiastical government which extended all over the island. Subsequently to the compromise, the two sees seem to have enjoyed, as far as it respected government, equal rights—precedency of rank in matters of form being alone left to the chair of St. Patrick.

73. RICHARD FITZ-RALPH.—(Succ. 1347, died 1360.)

He was a native of Dundalk, but educated at Oxford, under the tuition of Bakethorp, an eminent divine, and a great enemy to the begging friars, from whom he drank in kindred sentiments. He became Doctor of Divinity of Oxford in 1333, and was promoted to the Deanery of Lichfield; from thence he was advanced to the see of Armagh, and consecrated on the 8th of July, 1347, by John de Grandison, Bishop of Exeter, and three other bishops. He was a very learned divine, and an assiduous preacher. There is extant, in manuscript, a volume of his sermons, preached partly in England, partly in the churches of his province, and partly in France. These discourses afford ample testimony of his learning and of his virtues. He waged an incessant warfare against the mendicant orders, not merely in Ireland and England, but even in France, and in the presence of Pope Innocent VI. himself. "His holiness" committed the decision of the controversy to four cardinals, who gave their verdict against the archbishop; after which he was silenced by the Pope, and forbidden to disturb the subject further. He died the same year at the court of Rome, not without suspicion of having been poisoned by the friars, his enemies. He appears to have been one of the most distinguished divines of his day. Some historians have stated that he translated the Bible into Irish.

Foxe thus speaks of him in his "Book of Martyrs":—

In the catalogue of these learned and zealous defenders of Christ against Anti-christ, whom the Lord about this time began to raise up for the reanimation of his

church, I cannot omit to write something of the reverend prelate and famous clerk, Richard Armachanus, primate and archbishop of Ireland; a man for his life and learning so memorable, that they had none almost his better. His name was Richard Fizraf. Such was the capacity and dexterity of this man, that being commended to King Edward III. he was promoted by him, first, to be Archdeacon of Lichfield, then to be the Commissary of the University of Oxford; at length, to be Archbishop of Armagh in Ireland. He had cause to come to London at the time when there was contention between the friars and clergy about preaching and hearing confessions, &c. Whereupon this Armachanus, being requested to preach, made seven or eight sermons, wherein he propounded nine conclusions against the friars, for which he was cited by the friars to appear before this Pope Innocent VI., and so he went, and before the face of the Pope valiantly defended, both in preaching and in writing, the same conclusions, and therein stood constantly to the death, as John Wickliffe well testifies. William Botonerus testifying of him in like manner, says, 'That Armachanus first reproved begging-friars for hearing the confessions of professed nuns without licence of their superiors, and also of married women without knowledge of their husbands. What dangers and troubles he sustained by his persecutors, and how miraculously the Lord delivered him from their hands, and in what peril of thieves and searchers he was, and yet the Lord delivered him: yea, and in what dangers he was of the king's officers, who, coming with the king's letters, laid all the havens for him; and how the Lord Jesus delivered him, and gave him to triumph over all his enemies; how the Lord also taught him and brought him to the study of the Scriptures of God.' All this, with much more, he himself expresses in a certain prayer or confession made to Christ Jesus our Lord, in which he describes almost the whole history of his own life.

Previously to the time of our celebrated archbishop, a tract called "The Prayer and Complaint of the Ploughman," by an anonymous author, made a great noise. This treatise described the Pope as Antichrist, and feelingly denounced the corruptions of the church. Some other writings of the same stamp got currency in England about the same time. Of those persons, however, who preceded the time of John Wickliffe, and heralded in the Reformation, the most famous, perhaps, was Richard Fitz-Ralph. I would submit that this short history clearly proves, that the Roman Catholics of Ireland are warranted to believe, that the ancient church of this country may lay claim to have taken, in the person of its primate, a leading and distinguished part in the great work, which resulted in the glorious Protestant Reformation. We are told that a proposition was on foot for the canonisation of Fitz-Ralph. John Colton, Archbishop of Armagh, Richard Young, Bishop-elect of Bangor, and the Abbot of Osney, near Oxford, were commissioned by a bull of Pope Boniface IX. to inquire into certain miracles that were attributed to our great prelate, but by degrees the inquiry was laid aside, and the proposition came to nothing. It is unlikely that there should have been much zeal for creating a man a "saint," whose life was employed in opposing the friars.

74. MILO SWEETMAN.—(Succ. 1361, died 1380.)

This was a distinguished and a learned prelate; he was translated from the bishopric of Ossory, and was succeeded by

75. JOHN COLTON.—(Succ. 1382, resigned 1404.)

A native of Tirington, Norfolk, and LL.D. of Cambridge. He had been the first master of Gonville Hall in that university, and became afterwards dean of St. Patrick's, Dublin, and was for a while Lord Chancellor and Lord Justice of Ireland. He was employed by Richard II. as one of his ambassadors to the court of Rome. His reputation for virtue and learning was great, and his amiable qualities endeared him to all ranks of the people. He wrote a treatise in Latin on the cause and remedy of schism, and there are still extant some provincial constitutions which he promulgated.

76. NICHOLAS FLEMING.—(Succ. 1404, died 1416.)

He sent William Purcell as his proctor, to assist at the General Council of Constance, in 1415. His Provincial Constitutions and part of his Register, are still extant.

77. JOHN SWAYN.—(Succ. 1417, resigned 1431.)

He had been rector of Galtrim, in the county of Meath, and was consecrated to Armagh, at Rome, in February, 1417. He was sent by the Irish Parliament, along with Sir Christopher Preston, to bring before King Edward V. the grievances of this country. During his prelacy, the quarrel about the primacy between him and the Archbishop of Dublin ran high. He resigned in consequence of old age, and died a few years afterwards. He had founded in Drogheda a chapel and chantry, dedicated to St. Anne; and is buried at St. Peter's church, in that town.

78. JOHN PRENE.—(Succ. 1439, died 1443.)

He had been previously Archdeacon of Armagh and Vicar of Kep-pock, Drumcarre, and Strabanan. He likewise encountered the opposition of the then Archbishop of Dublin, on the question of the primacy.

79. JOHN MEY.—(Succ. 1444, died 1456.)

The same quarrel raged with unabated violence in his days. He was for a while Lord Deputy to Butler, Earl of Ormond and Wiltshire, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. He granted "forty days' indulgences" to all persons who should contribute towards providing a great bell, making some new windows, and effecting other repairs in St. Patrick's, Dublin. This he did at the petition of the dean and chapter of that cathedral: he likewise made a provision for the maintenance of a number of priests to pray for him and his predecessors. We can hence form an estimate of what sort his principles were.

80. JOHN BOLE.—(Succ. 1457, died, 1470.)

He was quite as superstitious as his predecessor. After his death,

the government of the see of Armagh was for four years committed to Richard Lang, Bishop of Kildare, who was extremely anxious to get the absolute appointment for himself. In this, however, he failed, although he enjoyed the temporalities during the ecclesiastical *inter-regnum*.

81. JOHN FOXALLS.—(Succ. 1475, died 1476.)

He was a Franciscan friar, and apparently an Englishman. He died in England the second year after his consecration, without having visited his diocese.

82. EDMUND CONNESBURGH.—(Succ. 1477, resigned 1479.)

He did not pay his fees to the Pope, who, for that reason, appointed Octavian, a Florentine, his nuncio, to hold in his hands the see of Armagh, and receive the temporalities until the fees were paid. Poor Archbishop Connesburgh did not enjoy his dignity long. The crafty Italian kept him poor and uneasy, and at last induced him, in consideration of a simoniacal pension of fifty marks per annum, to resign in his favour.

83. OCTAVIAN DE PALATIO.—(Succ. 1480, died 1513.)

He was almost the only one of the Irish prelates that resisted Lambert Simnel, the pretender to the English throne, who was generally in Ireland regarded as king. This impostor was crowned in Christ Church, Dublin, under the title of Edward VI. The Lord Deputy took part in this ceremonial. The Archbishop of Armagh, however, absented himself, continuing steadfast in his loyalty to the reigning prince, Henry VII. He was an active prelate, and held numerous provincial synods. He is buried in St. Peter's, Drogheda, in a vault built by himself.

84. JOHN KITE.—(Succ. 1513, resigned 1521.)

He was a native of London, a distinguished favourite of Henry VIII., and a confidant of Cardinal Wolsey. He obtained a royal license to be absent from his see as long as he pleased, and at the same time, notwithstanding the statute against absentees, made in the reign of Henry VI., to receive its temporalities. He subsequently resigned, and was advanced to the see of Carlisle, in England.

85. GEORGE CROMER.—(Succ. 1522, died 1542.)

During Archbishop Cromer's prelacy, King Henry VIII. abolished the Pope's supremacy; but in this he was opposed by the archbishop. After the act establishing the king's supremacy had passed, he did what he could to put a stop to the execution of it. The Act of Supremacy passed in Dublin, A.D. 1537, having been strenuously promoted

by Brown, Archbishop of Dublin, and notwithstanding the opposition of the primate, the principles of the Reformation made way in Ireland—Cromer was an Englishman.

86. GEORGE DOWDALL.—(Succ. 1543, died 1558.)

He was a native of the county Louth, and official to his predecessor Cromer. He succeeded to the archdiocese by the interest of St. Leger, the lord lieutenant, and was consecrated by Staples, Bishop of Meath, and by other bishops in December, 1543. The Pope had previously promoted another, Robert Wauchob, who, however, was never allowed possession, and thus the Pope could not confirm the appointment of Dowdall, although the latter was a strenuous maintainer of the papal supremacy. In 1550, Edward VI. sent his order into Ireland, for the use of the English liturgy. The Archbishop of Dublin, George Brown, zealously promoted the cause of the Reformation. The Archbishop of Armagh, on the other hand, was as zealous for the Latin mass. In consequence, he was deprived of the title of "primate of all Ireland," which title was by letters patent conferred on Archbishop Brown, and his successors, for ever. Disgusted with this affront, Dowdall went into voluntary banishment, and lived an exile during the remainder of the reign of King Edward VI. He was hospitably received and entertained by the Abbot of Centre, in Brabant. Meanwhile, his see was conferred on Hugh Goodacre, who died on the very year of Queen Mary's accession to the crown. This queen recalled Dowdall, and restored to him by letters patent and to his successors, the title of "Primate of all Ireland." In the April following his restoration, a royal commission was issued, empowering him and William Walsh, the elect Bishop of Meath, to deprive the married bishops and clergy. Accordingly they deprived of their sees, Staples, Bishop of Meath, and some time after, Brown, Archbishop of Dublin, Lancaster, Bishop of Kildare, and Travers, Bishop of Leighlin. Bale, the Bishop of Ossory, a stern opponent of Popery, went into exile; and Casey, Bishop of Limerick, cleaved to the reformed principles, though he lost his see. After Dowdall had thus lent himself to the effort that was made to obstruct the progress of truth, he held a provincial synod in Drogheda, one of the constitutions of which is memorable. It obliged "all rectors and vicars, who did not know how to preach, to hire one to preach for them, four times a year at least." The next year he caused a day of jubilee to be observed throughout all Ireland, for the restoration of Romanism. Afterwards in 1558, he took a journey into England on the affairs of the church, and died on the 15th of August in that year, just three months and two days before the death of Queen Mary herself. The see was thus vacant at the accession of Queen Elizabeth, and that Protestant Queen, after an interval of four years, nominated

87. ADAM LOFTUS.—(Succ. 1562, resigned 1567.)

He was an accomplished Englishman, born in Yorkshire, and the

younger son of an ancient family. He was consecrated to Armagh by Hugh Curwin, Queen Mary's Archbishop of Dublin, and two other prelates. His see was so impoverished by the devastations of Shane O'Neal, the rebel agitator of the day, that at his own desire he was translated to the archdiocese of Dublin. Here he occupied some high offices under the crown. He was twice keeper of the great seal, and afterwards appointed lord chancellor, an appointment which he retained till his death. He died of old age, and lies buried in St. Patrick's Church, within the rails of the altar. To his zeal, ability, and influence, Dublin is mainly indebted for the establishment of the University.

88. THOMAS LANCASTER,—(Succ. 1568, died 1584,)

Was an Englishman, chaplain to Queen Elizabeth, and treasurer of Salisbury. He was consecrated to Armagh by the Archbishop of Dublin and the Bishops of Meath and Kildare, on the 13th of June, 1568. In consequence of the poverty of his see, he was allowed to hold at once several preferments, both in England and Ireland.

89. JOHN LONG.—(Succ. 1584, died 1589.)

He was a Londoner, and Doctor of Divinity of King's College, Cambridge. He died at Drogheda, and was buried there in St. Peter's Church, as his predecessor also had been.

90. JOHN GARVEY.—(Succ. 1589, died 1594.)

This prelate was born in the county Kilkenny, but received his education at Oxford. He was translated from the bishopric of Kilmore to the primacy.

91. HENRY USSHER,—(Succ. 1595, died 1613,)

Was a native of Dublin, but educated partly at Cambridge and partly at Paris. He was at first rector of Taney, Rathfarnham, Donnybrook, and Kilgobbin, then Archdeacon of Dublin, from which he was advanced to the see of Armagh. He died at a good old age, after an active and useful life, and like many of his predecessors, is buried at St. Peter's Church, Drogheda.

92. CHRISTOPHER HAMILTON.—(Succ. 1613, died 1624.)

He was born at Calais, lived a bachelor, rebuilt his cathedral, which had been destroyed by O'Neal, and greatly enriched his see. His reputation for learning and virtue is great.

93. JAMES USSHER.—(Succ. 1624, died 1655.)

This was the great Archbishop Ussher. He was born in the parish of St. Nicholas, in Dublin, on the 4th January, 1580. He surpassed in learning all his contemporaries. Though unswerving in loyalty to

King Charles and the monarchy, he was so highly revered by all parties, that Oliver Cromwell, when informed of his death, claimed the honour of burying him at his own charge. He was accordingly interred with great state in Westminster Abbey, on the 17th of April, 1655, having died on the 20th of the month preceding. He was nephew of Archbishop Henry Ussher, above-mentioned.

94. JOHN BRAMHALL,—(Succ. 1660, died 1663.)

Was one of the most distinguished men of his day, and perhaps the most valuable prelate whom the Church of Ireland ever possessed. A native of Pontefract, in Yorkshire, and of an ancient family, he possessed an influence that would have secured him promotion in England; he was led, however, by providential circumstances to this country, in which he rendered to the church services for which its highest honours were an inadequate recompense. He was consecrated Bishop of Derry, in 1634, but was called away from his valuable exertions in his see by the tumultuous character of the times. The great rebellion soon began to rage, and King Charles I. required in his immediate service, the talent and the loyalty of Bishop Bramhall. On the death of the king, a reward was set on his head by the Parliament, and he saved himself with difficulty by flying to France. During the rebellion, the Church of Ireland had got into a state of great disorder; a number of the sees were vacant, as also many of the livings, into several of which unordained persons had been obtruded. On the restoration of Charles II., Dr. Bramhall was advanced to the archbishopric of Armagh, and no man was better qualified to repair the disorder that was prevalent in the church. The king restored all its temporalities to the church, appointed new bishops to fill the vacant sees, and issued his royal mandate to our new Archbishop of Armagh for their consecration. By virtue of this, the archbishop, in one day, assisted by the Bishops of Raphoe, Kilmore, Ossory, and Clogher, consecrated two archbishops and ten bishops. To his subsequent zeal and prudence the Church of Ireland stood indebted for the ample provision which the Irish clergy long enjoyed; a provision which modern liberalism has almost altogether frittered away.

95. JAMES MARGETSON.—(Succ. 1663, died 1678.)

He was an Englishman, learned and pious. Brought over to Ireland by the famous, but unfortunate Earl of Strafford, under Charles I., he experienced all the vicissitudes of those unhappy times, with difficulty preserving his own life, which was devoted to the service of his persecuted brethren. He was Dean of Christ Church, Dublin, when the rebellion broke out, and he was recognised as the lawful possessor of that office at the restoration of Charles II., although he had not in the interval either enjoyed the emoluments or resided in Ireland. Immediately on the restoration he was consecrated to the archbishopric of Dublin, and thence, on the death of Archbishop Bramhall, promoted to Armagh; of this see he was a great benefactor.

86. MICHAEL BOYLE.—(Succ. 1678, died 1702.)

Was the son of Richard Boyle, Archbishop of Tuam, and was successively Bishop of Cork, Archbishop of Dublin, and Primate. He died very rich.

97. NARCISSUS MARSH.—(Succ. 1702, died 1713.)

He was an Englishman, and had been principal of St. Alban's Hall, Oxford, thence he was preferred to the Provostship of Trinity College, Dublin, and after various steps of promotion, at last attained the see of Armagh. He was the founder of Marsh's Library, in Dublin, and is buried in St. Patrick's Church in that city.

98. THOMAS LINDSAY.—(Succ. 1713, died 1724.)

An Englishman by birth, he came into this country with Henry, Lord Capel, afterwards lord lieutenant. He was successively Dean of St. Patrick's, Bishop of Raphoe, and Primate. He improved the condition of his cathedral, enlarging and providing for the choir. He died in Dublin, and was buried in Christ Church.

99. HUGH BOULTER.—(Succ. 1724, died 1742.)

He was transferred from the see of Bristol to the arch-diocese of Armagh, to the improvement of which he liberally devoted himself. He erected four houses in Drogheda for the reception of clergymen's widows, which houses he endowed with an estate. Dr. Boulter had employed as his secretary in England, Ambrose Philips, the poet, whom he brought over with him to this country, and who, through the archbishop's influence, was appointed here to some profitable places under the government, and at last represented the borough of Armagh in parliament.

100. JOHN HOADLY.—(Succ. 1742, died 1747.)

This prelate was also an Englishman, and brother to Hoadly, Bishop of Hereford. He seems to have been more concerned in promoting agricultural than religious improvement in Ireland. He lies buried at Tallaght, near Dublin, in which locality he erected a splendid residence for himself.

101. GEORGE STONE.—(Succ. 1747, died 1765.)

Born in Hampshire, and educated at Oxford; he became Dean of Ferns, then Dean of Derry, then Bishop of Derry, and, finally, Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of all Ireland. He appears to have been a man altogether devoted to politics, and but little suited for an ecclesiastic. He left behind him the reputation of having been the handsomest man of his day.

102. RICHARD ROBINSON.—(Succ. 1765, died 1794.)

Was a native of the sister country, and though sumptuous in the

display which he made in public, he was, when he could thereby promote the real interests of the church, liberal in the expenditure of his ecclesiastical income. Although not remarkable for hospitality towards his clergy, he was their sincere friend; the exercise of friendship, however, could not supersede the duty of hospitality especially imposed on such a man by Holy Scripture itself. He founded and endowed the Observatory at Armagh.

103. WILLIAM NEWCOME.—(Succ. 1795, died 1800.)

He came over to this country as chaplain to the Earl of Hertford, the lord lieutenant, and after various steps of promotion, succeeded Dr. Robinson in the primacy. He obtained rather notoriety than fame for some publications of his, in which he proposed a re-translation of the Scriptures upon the ground of room for improvements in the authorised version. The disturbance of the public mind, and the detriment to theological works which must result from the adoption of a new version would be but poorly compensated for by improvements in expression, the value of which none but the critics could realize. He died in Dublin, and was buried in the chapel of Trinity College.

104. WILLIAM STUART.—(Succ. 1800, died 1822.)

Primate Stuart was the fifth son of the Earl of Bute. He was translated to Armagh from the see of St. David's, to which he had been consecrated in 1793. He was succeeded by the present archbishop,

105. LORD GEORGE BERESFORD,—(Succ. 1822,)

Who was translated from the see of Dublin to the primacy.

Such is a very brief outline of the history of the bishops and archbishops of Armagh, commencing with Saint Patrick, who was the first of them. With respect to this distinguished missionary himself, we need have no controversy with the Roman Catholics. Equally with them, we admit the apostolicity of his mission. By what particular bishop or bishops he was ordained, need not be a matter of serious disputation. He was the nephew of Martin, Bishop of Tours, in France, under whom he was educated, and by whom he was ordained deacon. By Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre, in Burgundy, he was ordained priest; and that bishop, as we are informed by history, strengthened his desire to preach the Gospel in Ireland. It would appear highly probable that he consecrated and set him apart to the work; and some respectable modern authorities allege as much. It is, however, beyond any manner of question, that on the subject of his consecration to the office of bishop, history leaves us quite uncertain as to the name of the consecrating bishop. Since, however, our controversy is with the Roman Catholics, let us for argument sake concede to them the point (*dato non concesso*), which they are so fond of urging, that Saint Patrick was ordained by Celestin, Bishop of Rome.

The predecessors of Celestin in the see of Rome, from the time of Saint Paul, or Saint Peter, were as follows :—

	A. D.		A. D.
1 St. PETER AND ST. PAUL.		23 Stephen . . .	253
2 Linus, Bishop of Rome . . .	58	24 Sixtus II. . . .	257
3 Cletus	68	25 Dionysius	258
4 Clement	93	26 Felix	271
5 Evaristus	100	27 Eutychianus . . .	276
6 Alexander	109	28 Caius	283
7 Xystus or Sistus	116	29 Marcellinus	296
8 Telesphorus	129	30 Marcellus	304
9 Hyginus	138	31 Eusebius	309
10 Pius	142	32 Melchiades	311
11 Anicetus	156	33 Sylvester	313
12 Soter	168	34 Mark	335
13 Eleutherius	177	35 Julius	336
14 Victor	192	36 Liberius	352
15 Zephyrinus	201	37 Felix II.	359
16 Calixtus	219	38 Damascus	666
17 Urbanus	224	39 Siricius	384
18 Pontianus	231	40 Anastasius	398
19 Anterus	235	41 Innocentius	402
20 Fabianus	236	42 Zozimus	417
21 Cornelius	250	43 Boniface	423
22 Lucius	252	44 Celestinus	428

That there may be, as it were, a bird's-eye view of the whole succession laid before my readers, I here recapitulate the names of the Irish primates, from the great Irish apostle :—

	A. D.		A. D.
45 St. PATRICK	444	70 Conmach	798
46 Binen	455	71 Torbach	807
47 St. Jarlath	465	72 Naad	808
48 Cormac	482	73 Flanguss	812
49 Dubtach	497	74 Artrigius	822
50 Ailild I.	513	75 Eugene	833
51 Ailild II.	526	76 Faranan	834
52 Dubtach II.	536	77 Dermod	849
53 David	548	78 Factna	852
54 Feidlemaid	551	79 Ainnire	874
55 Cairlan	578	80 Catasach I.	875
56 Eochaid	588	81 Maelcob	883
57 Senach	598	82 Mael-Brigid	885
58 Mac-Laisir	610	83 Joseph	927
59 Thomian	623	84 Mael Patrick	926
60 Segenc	661	85 Catasach II.	937
61 Flan-Febla	688	86 Muredach	957
62 Suibhney	715	87 Dubdalethy II. . . .	966
63 Congusa	730	88 Murechan	998
64 Ccle-Peter	750	89 Mael Mury	1001
65 Ferdachry	758	90 Amalgaid	1021
66 Foendelach	768	91 Dubdalethy III. . . .	1050
67 Dubdalethy I.	778	92 Cumasach	1065
68 Affiat	793	93 Maelisa	1065
69 Cudiniscas	794	94 Donald	1092

	A. D.		A. D.
95 Celsus . . .	1106	123 John Mey . . .	1444
96 Maurice . . .	1129	124 John Bole . . .	1457
97 Malachy O'Morgair . . .	1134	125 John Foxalls . . .	1475
98 Gelesius . . .	1137	126 Edmond Connesburgh . . .	1477
99 Cornelius . . .	1174	127 Octavian de Palatio . . .	1480
100 Gilbert . . .	1175	128 John Kite . . .	1513
101 Maelisa . . .	1184	129 George Cromer . . .	1522
102 Amlave . . .	1184	130 George Dowdall . . .	1543
103 Thomas O'Connor . . .	1185	131 Adam Loftus . . .	1562
104 Eugene . . .	1206	132 Thomas Lancaster . . .	1568
105 Luke Netterville . . .	1220	133 John Long . . .	1584
106 Donat O'Eidabra . . .	1226	134 John Garvey . . .	1589
107 Albert, of Cologn . . .	1240	135 Henry Ussher . . .	1595
108 Reiner . . .	1247	136 Christopher Hampton . . .	1613
109 Abraham O'Connellan . . .	1257	137 James Ussher . . .	1624
110 Patrick O'Scanlain . . .	1261	138 John Bramhall . . .	1660
111 Nicholas Mac-Molissa . . .	1272	139 James Margetson . . .	1663
112 John Taaf . . .	1305	140 Michael Boyle . . .	1678
113 Walter de Jorse . . .	1306	141 Narcissus Marsh . . .	1702
114 Rowland Jorse . . .	1311	142 Thomas Lindsay . . .	1712
115 Stephen Segrave . . .	1322	143 Hugh Boulter . . .	1724
116 David O'Hiraghty . . .	1334	144 John Hoadly . . .	1742
117 Richard Fitz-Ralph . . .	1347	145 George Stone . . .	1747
118 Milo Sweetman . . .	1361	146 Richard Robinson . . .	1765
119 John Colton . . .	1382	147 William Newcome . . .	1795
120 Nicholas Fleming . . .	1404	148 William Stuart . . .	1800
121 John Swayn . . .	1417	149 LORD GEORGE BERESFORD, present Archbishop . . .	1822
122 John Prene . . .	1438		

Thus does it appear quite plain that our Irish church possesses the mark of the "apostles' fellowship." In that fellowship it has "continued." It is no separating body; it is not a self-constituted one; and as this is the case with the Irish branch, so it is likewise with the sister church in England. That this may also be seen, I submit the list of the archbishops of Canterbury from Augustin, who was the first of them, placing at their head the succession of the bishops of Rome, down to Gregory I., called "the great," who consecrated Augustin.

	A. D.		A. D.
1 ST. PETER AND ST. PAUL . . .		16 Calixtus . . .	219
2 Linus, Bishop of Rome . . .	58	17 Urbanus . . .	224
3 Cletus . . .	68	18 Pontianus . . .	231
4 Clement . . .	93	19 Anternus . . .	235
5 Evaristus . . .	100	20 Fabianus . . .	236
6 Alexander . . .	109	21 Cornelius . . .	250
7 Xystus or Sixtus . . .	116	22 Lucius . . .	252
8 Telesphorus . . .	129	23 Stephen . . .	253
9 Hyginus . . .	138	24 Sixtus II. . .	257
10 Pius . . .	142	25 Dionysius . . .	258
11 Anicetus . . .	156	26 Felix . . .	271
12 Soter . . .	168	27 Eutychianus . . .	276
13 Eleutherius . . .	177	28 Caius . . .	283
14 Victor . . .	192	29 Marcellinus . . .	296
15 Zephyrinus . . .	201	30 Marcellus . . .	304

	A.D.		A.D.
31 Eusebius	309	86 Wulfhelm	924
32 Melchιάdes	311	87 Odo	934
33 Sylvester	313	88 Dunstan	959
34 Mark	335	89 Ethelgar	988
35 Julius	336	90 Siricius	989
36 Liberius	352	91 Alfrie	993
37 Felix II.	359	92 Elphege	1009
38 Damascus	366	93 Livingus	1013
39 Siricius	384	94 Agelnoth	1020
40 Anastasius	398	95 Eadsinus	1038
41 Innocentius	402	96 Robert	1050
42 Zozimus	417	97 Stigand	1052
43 Boniface	418	98 Lanfranc	1070
44 Celestinus	423	99 Anselm	1093
45 Sixtus III.	432	100 Ralph	1114
46 Leo the Great	440	101 William Corbell	1122
47 Hilary	461	102 Theobald	1138
48 Simplicius	467	103 Thomas a Becket	1162
49 Felix III.	483	104 Richard	1171
50 Gelasius	492	105 Baldwin	1184
51 Anastasius	496	106 Reginald Fitz-Jocelin	1191
52 Symmachus	498	107 Hubert Walter	1193
53 Hormisdas	514	108 Stephen Langton	1206
54 John	523	109 Richard Wethershed	1292
55 Felix IV.	526	110 Edmund	1234
56 Boniface II.	530	111 Boniface of Savoy	1244
57 John II.	532	112 Robert Kilwarby	1272
58 Agapetus	535	113 John Peckham	1278
59 Silverius	536	114 Robert Winchelsey	1293
60 Vigilinus	540	115 W. Reynolds	1313
61 Pelagius	555	116 Simon Mephram	1327
62 John III.	560	117 John Stratford	1333
63 Benedict	574	118 J. De Ufford	1348
64 Pelagius II.	578	119 T. Bradwardin	1349
65 Gregory the Great, who sent	590	120 Simon Islip	1349
66 Augustine, First Arch- bishop Canterbury	596	121 Simon Langham	1366
67 Laurentius	604	122 William Witesley	1369
68 Mellitus	617	123 Simon Sudbury	1375
69 Justus	629	124 William Courtenay	1381
70 Honorius	626	125 Thomas Arundel	1396
71 Adeodatus	654	126 Henry Chicheley	1414
72 Theodore	668	127 John Stafford	1443
73 Brithwald	692	128 John Kemp	1452
74 Tatwin	731	129 Thomas Bouchier	1454
75 Nothelm	735	130 John Morton	1486
76 Cuthbert	740	131 Henry Deane	1501
77 Bregwin	758	132 William Warham	1504
78 Lambert	764	133 Thomas Cranmer	1533
79 Athelard	793	134 Matthew Parker	1539
80 Wulfred	806	135 Edmond Grindal	1575
81 Theogild	832	136 John Whitgift	1583
82 Ceolnoth	832	137 Richard Bancroft	1604
83 Athelred	873	138 George Abbot	1611
84 Plegmund	889	139 William Laud	1633
85 Athelm	915	140 William Juxon	1660
		141 Gilbert Sheldon	1663
		142 William Sancroft	1678

	A.D.		A.D.
143 John Tillotson .	. 1691	149 Thomas Secker .	. 1758
144 Thomas Tenison .	. 1694	150 F. Cornwallis .	. 1768
145 William Wake .	. 1715	151 John Moore .	. 1783
146 John Potter .	. 1737	152 C. M. Sutton .	. 1805
147 Thomas Herring .	. 1747	153 WILLIAM HOWLEY, pre-	
148 Matthew Hutton .	. 1757	sent Archbishop .	. 1828

Upon the whole it is clearly evident that our church is apostolic in doctrine, and apostolic in constitution too.

I have been the more emphatic, and dwelt at greater length upon the latter head, because it is really the one single point on which Papists are, and have been, accustomed to glory, and which they have persuaded multitudes to imagine that they alone can lay claim to. There is no manner of doubt that orthodoxy of doctrine is the most important requirement of the Christian church. Connexion with the true church, especially as connected with the Roman Catholic controversy, is important, it is satisfactory; possession of the true *doctrine* is, however, the saving principle. With respect to this, the spiritual man is most of all anxious; on the subject of the other, the formal professor is disposed to glory; and where he possesses what he conceives to be a legitimate apostolical position, he is accustomed to use it as an instrument to take hold of the latent superstition which so naturally grows up in the breast of fallen man in order to keep him from seeking the better part, which is union with the Head, Christ Jesus. We show that in our church the believer is at once nurtured with doctrine that is evangelical, and holds a position that is strictly apostolical—that that church possesses all in which Rome glories, so far as it is excellent; free, however, from those monstrous corruptions in doctrine by which Rome is defiled.

CHAPTER VII.

APOSTOLIC TRUTH—APOSTOLIC ORDER.

I have in the preceding chapters considered the *status*—the standing, the nature, and character of the united church of England and Ireland. I have showed that it is apostolical in doctrine and apostolical in connexion. No one, however, who is savingly acquainted with Christian truth, will, for one moment, think of putting these two attributes of the church into competition, one with the other. The Christian doctrine is, beyond all comparison, the more important of the two. It is not written, “By the *church* ye are saved, through faith,” or “by grace ye are saved through the *church*,” or “by grace

ye are saved through faith ; it is the gift of the *church* ;" but "by grace ye are saved, through faith ; it is the gift of God." When the convinced gaoler tremblingly demanded, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved ?" the answer was, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved ;" not, "Believe in the *church*, and thou shalt be saved." And so it is all through Scripture ; Christ is exalted, faith in Christ is exalted ; and so will it ever be with him that has realized, in deed and in truth, the salvation which the Scripture proclaims. What the soul, in its anxious aspirings after happiness, wants, is Christ. In its hours of darkness and despondency, nothing can meet its case but Christ, and he can be apprehended by "faith alone." The Eucharist without faith is an empty ceremony ; the absolution of the church without faith is an ineffectual form. Prayers without faith are felt to be wearisome and unprofitable ; in one word, without faith the Christian is incapable of appropriating Christ, or deriving any sort of benefit from the ordinances of the church. Faith, then, is the grand requisite, and that which quickens it is the Word of God. He who thus holds, feels, and believes, is rightly instructed ; but he who, instead of all this, raises the cry of "The church, the church !" shows clearly that he has no light in him.

The church, indeed, is the witness and keeper of Holy Writ ; she is its lawful expounder ; and when she magnifies this her office, when she holds forth the Word of Life, when she rightly divides it to the people, when she teaches all things that Christ has commanded, she has the gracious promise of her Master, that he will be with her, and that he will make his Word in her mouth, "mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds." But if she faithlessly exalt her ministrations, to the disparagement of the living Word, if she teach the people to look to her rather than to her Lord, to regard the teaching of her ministers rather than the teaching of the Spirit of God, he will make her loathsome and contemptible ; he will take the lowliest of the people, the coal-heavers and the pugilists, the cobblers and the tinkers, and he will pour out his Spirit on them, and put in their mouths the words of wisdom and of power, and make them, though totally unconnected with the apostolic church, the shepherds and the pastors of his flock. Their voice will be heard, and their words will be influential, and their persons will be honoured, while the taunt and the sneer, and the wagging of the head, public hatred and public scorn, will be poured upon the mummers who would transform the glorious ordinances of the church into an idolatrous mass, or into a farce more contemptible still. Away with the poor, paltry, wretched, sneaking drivellers, who, under the name of Tractarians, have been desecrating the church with the soul-destroying delusions of Popery ! The zeal that animates them is genuine fanaticism. The word fanaticism is derived from *fanum*, which means, a shrine or temple ; and it is an unquestionable fact—a fact illustrative of the wretchedly fallen condition of human nature—that a man may become so possessed with a sense of the sanctity of a *temple*, that he may become a

monomaniac on the subject—so engrossed with the one idea of the consecrated shrine, that it shall occupy his waking and his sleeping thoughts; that it shall be his idol—his god; that within it he shall feel a present deity, which he can realize no where else; that he shall be willing to lay down his life for the object of his adoration, and abhor and persecute, even to the death, as profane, as heathens, and as publicans, all those who do not sympathise in his strange passion. Such a state of mind is fanaticism, and such a person is a fanatic, and those well deserve the appellation who idolise the church, and derive the virtue of its ordinances from the apostolical position which its ministers occupy.

I was a short time since at Leeds. The day was Sunday, and I went to the parish church; this is a most magnificent structure, certainly the handsomest parish church I ever saw. It is capable of affording comfortable sitting accommodation to between three and four thousand persons, while almost all the sittings are free and inappropriate—the several pews consisting of single benches, and being without doors. All the woodwork is solid oak, carved and varnished in the most beautiful manner. The building is in the finest style of Gothic architecture; the windows are superb, of stained glass, while all the details are conceived in a taste that is bold and elegant. The mind is struck with the grandeur of the place; and crowded as it was by an intelligent congregation, of whom the vast majority were well-dressed operatives, it could not fail to impress me with a profound sense of the immense importance of the results which must arise from the performance in it of the chaste and admirable ministrations of our holy church. The services are all conducted in the cathedral fashion. Yorkshire is celebrated for the musical taste of the people, and Leeds is inferior to no part of the county in the possession of this particular quality. On the occasion referred to, the congregation very generally joined in chanting the responses, and the combined effect produced by music, the building, the people, and the services, was particularly imposing. Dr. Hook is the vicar. The building is altogether the result of his zeal, energy, and talent. He took the lead in the services, assisted by a large body of clergy, and a numerous and excellent choir. It was impossible to be present without perceiving that on him the whole attention was concentrated: every one seemed to feel the dominancy of his master-mind; he was felt as the author, the contriver, the ruler of the whole; and well did he act the High Priest. While all regarded him as “the great man,” it was abundantly manifest that he did not for a moment forget that he was so in truth. A more admirable reader it would be hard to find; his clear and sonorous voice filled every part of the vast area, so that not one word was lost. When the first division of the morning prayer was concluded, he proceeded to the communion table at a rapid pace, followed by the clergy, who all had seats arranged for them within the ample rails. The Doctor stood pre-eminent among the rest, the *Pontifex Maximus* of the day, and having read the office with the thundering accompaniments of the

organ, at its conclusion he hurried to the pulpit. I was particularly struck with the rapidity of his movements, which I only remember to have seen equalled many years ago in Popish chapels, to which, for curiosity sake, (God forgive me!) I used occasionally to go. In the pulpit, with his face towards the aisle, he read "the bidding prayer," which is a very quaint and formal composition, mentioning by name, not merely the queen, but the bishop of the diocese, and distinguishing the various ranks and degrees in the State. This concluded, he suddenly turned towards the communion table,—as if God Almighty (I speak it with reverence,) were seated there—dropped down on his knees, and rapidly read through the Lord's Prayer. After which, rising up, he delivered his text, and read a very ingenious and clever sermon, insisting upon sacramental grace. Deformed though his proceedings were by Popish tricks, these were so amazingly well done, that they did not offend the spectator, nor could they, to one who was able to appreciate its excellency, nullify the truly spiritual and Scriptural liturgy of our church. Nevertheless, the whole thing left a painful impression on the mind. Here was evidently an able man, himself misled, and misleading others; unconsciously deriving incense to his own pride from the sacred services of the Almighty, deadening the consciences of his hearers to the spiritualities of the Gospel, obscuring the glory of his Saviour by the carnality of outward and visible things, and uttering not one truth that could heal the broken-hearted, cheer the disconsolate, or minister to the distressed the comforts of a dying Saviour's love; flattering himself, however, at the same time, that all was well, when all was ill, and that as he broke the bread of the sacrament to the people, he was, by virtue of his commission, feeding them with that body and blood of Christ, which they could eat none otherwise than through a faith living and abiding in themselves.

I should not, for my part, have the slightest objection to the circumstances of dignity and grandeur with which the doctor had invested the services in his church, had he not abandoned evangelical truth. I am under the impression that the evangelical clergy, as they are called, constantly err in the other direction. Their buildings, and the accompaniments of their ministrations, not unfrequently verge towards the mean and shabby, and would seem calculated to engender low and sordid feelings in the people. The noble services of our church admit of all the refinements, and I will repeat, the grandeur with which Dr. Hook has endued them; but his paltry manœuvres, his Popish priestcraft, produce a strong feeling that he is not imbued with a true sense of the omnipresence of the Deity, of the nature and the glorious attributes of the Most High; while the pictures and images of the apostles and the Virgin Mary, so conspicuously exhibited in his stained glass windows and elsewhere—being in the direct teeth of the express admonitions, and reiterated, I may almost say, supplicatory warnings of the church, in her incomparable Homilies "on the peril of idolatry"—show that he is far from having imbibed the spirit of that holy

mother for whom he professes so great a reverence. However, any doubt on the subject of his state of mind is set at rest by his sermons. He may be pronounced the very champion of sacramental grace, and he distinctly repudiates the Protestant doctrine of "justification by faith alone;" hence he is an essential Papist—circumstances alone are necessary to render him a professed one.

The Tractarians utterly mistake the genius of the Christian religion, to say nothing of their total misapprehension of its doctrines. That religion deals with men's hearts. These it moulds, frames, and fashions, making them the dwelling-places of the Most High. Its grand operation is upon the human character, and it effects all its purposes by one single exhibition—a dying and a rising Saviour. It is not its mere object to produce a certain type of human conduct, but it is also its object to produce that effect simply and entirely by the manifestation of Christ to the soul. A devotion kindled by images will not do; an effect upon the spirits resulting from music, dresses, and architecture—from the bowings and kneelings, or extraordinary postures of a priest, will not do. A sense of humiliation arising from the consciousness of one's own littleness, as contrasted with the magnificence of a building, and the towering spirit of the man that formed it, will not do. The outpourings of a liberality upon objects, however deserving, intended to be the purchase money of a place in paradise, will not do. A zeal against disorder, which grows out of a glowing sense of due order in the church, will not do. A warmth kindled by the multiplication or repetition of stated prayers, because there is thought to be a merit in them, will not do. All this is "strange fire." The fire which kindled the altars under the old law came down from heaven. It was to be kept for ever burning, and never to go out. (Leviticus vi. 13). And they that used strange fire, died. (Lev. x.) The law and its sanction were types for us. Our devotions, the religious impressions on our minds, the humiliation of our hearts, the exercise of our charity, the zeal that moves and the love that sets our souls on fire, must arise from direct intercourse with Christ, through the Spirit, by faith; and if this grand peculiarity be overlooked, then Christ is trampled on, and an idol is substituted in his stead.

The essential attribute of Christianity is, an inspiration from on High; the chosen name of the Saviour is, "Emmanuel, which is (being interpreted) God with us." Here is a name that applied not merely to the incarnation—it has reference to the real presence of Christ continually in his people.

The Christian religion abolishes, blots out, and flings dust and ashes upon carnal outward forms, and makes "Christ all and in all" (Colos. iii. 10). Not merely "in all," but "all"—not merely "in all," as an abiding spirit, but "all," as the sole and only means of attaining to the possession of that spirit—"all," as the sum total of outward religion, "in all," as the vitalising influence that is connected with it.

Here is "the mystery which hath been hid from ages, and from

generations"—what is it?—"God would make known to us, what is the riches of the glory of this mystery"—what is it?—It is "Christ in you the hope of glory" (Colossians i. 27). Mark how the apostle magnifies this mystery, and observe in the same Epistle how he deprecates and treats as dross and dung, the wretched rudiments of the world. (Chap. ii. 20—23). And thus learn how utterly at variance with the great object of the gospel, are the wretched stupidities of the Tractarians.

The devil well knows the importance of the "mystery" that I thus dwell upon. He cannot so blind men's eyes, as to prevent them from knowing that there is a mystery in religion. What then does he do? He persuades them that it exists in something external to themselves; in the water of one sacrament, or in the bread and wine of another; in the person of the priest, or in the aggregate of the whole church; and this principle, once admitted, develops itself ultimately into full-grown Popery, in which everything is instinct with the Spirit of God, save and except the heart of the Christian. The Holy Spirit is invoked by the Church of Rome, to descend into mortar, wax, stones, clay, swords, vestments, buildings, bells, water, and oil, and salt, scapulars, *Agnus Dei*s, crucifixes, and all sorts of trumpery; while the very same church anathematizes, with "bell, book, and candle," the saving principle that it is the sanctification of the Holy Ghost, through a justifying faith in Christ alone, that constitutes the man a Christian.

I trust, then, that my readers may never fall into the mistake of supposing that Christian order can stand in place of Christian life. The methodist preacher, the congregationalist, the baptist, or the ranter, however irregular his position, if he really preach "Christ and him crucified," and experience the power of the truth, is ten thousand times a more honourable and useful character, than the most learned Tractarian that Oxford ever produced.

The doctrines that are popularly called "evangelic," are the genuine doctrines of the church.

When evangelic truth and apostolic order go hand in hand, admirable is the combination. Thus instructed, and thus placed, the weakest Christian may meet with confidence the boldest champion that Popery ever produced, and carry off a victory, even by the confession of the Papists themselves.

But while Evangelic truth is certainly a mighty weapon, without apostolic order on the part of its advocate, the Papist will have something to say, which will at least appear to be weighty, and which will satisfy his partisans.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE STATUS OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

Having, then, everything in our church that can enable us most successfully to fight its battles against all adversaries, and particularly against the Papists—apostolicity of doctrine and apostolicity of position—let us proceed to consider, on the other hand, the nature, character, and standing of the Church of Rome, and more especially of those branches of it of late planted in these countries.

There is no manner of doubt that the Roman Church was originally a pure and holy one. The prevalent opinion is, that Saint Peter preached in it.

When in his First Epistle, addressing the Christians dispersed over all the world, under the denomination of "the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia," (1 Peter, i. 1), he joins in the salutation with himself, "the church that is at Babylon, and Marcus his son;" (v. 13;) it has been ordinarily interpreted that he meant the Church at Rome and St. Mark. Here it is said that he preached, and that St. Mark wrote his gospel under his, St. Peter's, instruction. Eusebius, the most ancient ecclesiastical historian whose works are extant, records these facts in his second book; he states that at Rome St. Peter confounded Simon Magus, preached with great success, and was at last crucified with his head downwards. To gainsay historical records so express would seem to be a likely way to bring all history into doubt. But whatever may be thought about the residency and preaching of St. Peter at Rome, there can be no manner of question but that St. Paul preached there. (See Acts, chap. xxvii.) And in his Epistle to the Romans, written before his arrival there, (Romans, i. 10, 11,) he testifies that "the faith" of the members of that church was "spoken of throughout the world." (ver. 8.)

The Church of Rome, then, is most certainly apostolic in its origin; and indubitable history testifies, that for a length of time it continued to be to the nations of the earth a burning and a shining light.

But both Christ and his apostles foretold, that in the lapse of time there would come to pass a great apostasy from the Christian faith; and the whole Scripture of the Old and of the New Testament conveys to us the astounding truth, that the famous Church of Rome—built up by the two great apostles; the Apostle of the circumcision, and the Apostle of the uncircumcision; that the very Church of Rome should be, in the fulness of time, the head and leader of the revolt from Christ, of the rebellion against him; in a word, of the great foretold Apostasy. When our Lord, announcing the state of things that should arise after

his departure, and that should exist toward the end of the world, declares that there should be "false Christs and false prophets," and a prevalent inclination to seduce and to deceive his elect; (compare Matt. xxiv., Mark xiii., and Luke xxi.) that there should be "wars, and rumours of wars; nation rising against nation, and kingdom against kingdom;" and that his followers should be "delivered up to councils, beaten in synagogues, and brought before rulers and kings for his name sake;" he furnishes us with the clearest intimation that the glorious truths of the Gospel should be perverted, obscured, and abandoned, for in their light and with their maintenance such occurrences as he foreshows would be impossible. However, his words merely foretel an extremely deplorable condition of the church and of the world, without conveying to us much that would enable us to particularise the evil that was to be apprehended. It is from the writings of his apostles that we are enabled to gather the precise bearing of his own language.

St. Peter is emphatic on the subject; "There were false prophets among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them." (2 Peter ii. 1.) In these words he announces a departure or apostasy from the faith, for they should "deny the Lord that bought them;" and yet he intimates to us, that this denial should not be open and explicit, but secret and hypocritical, for he assimilates the "false teachers," whose coming he predicts, to the "false prophets" under the law. Now these false prophets, so far from *openly* denying Jehovah, constantly spoke in his name, saying, "the Lord had said," when "the Lord had not spoken." "They feared the Lord, and served their own gods;" they worshipped idols, whilst they called on the name of the Most High. But it is a truth demonstrable from Scripture, that those who act thus, are not merely said to *corrupt* the service of God, but to *abandon* it altogether; and, as such was the character of the apostasy of the false prophets, we may infer from the language of St. Peter, that that which should arise in the Christian church would be similar. He declares that the love of money should be a ruling motive with these "false teachers," who, through covetousness, should with feigned words "make merchandise" of the church. (ver. 3.) And by using as an illustration of the awful spiritual calamity the fall of the angels, (ver. 3,) he gives us to understand, that the announced corruption should involve the ruin of churches once eminent and highly favoured. When he tells us, that the abomination should come in "privily," he leads us to understand that the apostasy was not to be looked for as an event, but as the result of the gradual spread of moral disorder. The picture that he gives of the state of the world during its prevalence, (2 Peter, ii. 3,) is exceedingly fearful. St. Jude in his Epistle, short as it is, forcibly delineates the same sad state of things. Still both these apostles leave us much to learn with respect to the details of the apostasy which they predict.

It is in the Epistles of St. Paul that the apostasy is most strikingly delineated. The second chapter of the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians is celebrated for the extraordinary fulness of its development of the coming evil. My work would merge into a series of sermons if I attempted to expand to their full extent the views brought before us in this chapter; I shall, therefore, not do so, but merely give a summary of its contents, entreating my readers, each for himself, to study it diligently. St. Paul here, then, shows us that the apostasy should be almost universal in its spread; (ver. 10—12;) that it should be consummated and presided over by an individual of vast power, who should confirm his unholy pretensions by false miracles, by signs, and lying wonders, (ver. 9,) which should the more readily prevail through a preparedness for delusion on the part of his victims. (ver. 10, 11.) He informs us that this great adversary of the true faith should occupy an exalted place in the church; should arrogate to himself divine powers, exalting himself even above God; (ver. 4;) all this, of course, not by open opposition, but in the way of delusion, as though he could bring God from heaven, and make money by exhibiting him, as it were, to the people. He calls this tremendous person by the very name wherewith Christ designated Judas, "the son of perdition;" (ver. 2, see John xvii. 3;) thus giving us to understand that he should possess the apostolic office, and therefore be a great bishop; apostate, in fact, while professing singular reverence for his Master; kissing him while betraying him. He tells us that the antagonistic power to this frightful system of apostasy should be the Word of God, the spirit of which breathed forth by the faithful, should have a consuming effect upon the Apostasy. (ver. 8.) He further shows us the immense duration of the thing; the "mystery of iniquity" was working in the apostles' day, but it was then kept down by a counteracting influence; (ver. 7;) this counteracting influence was the persecuting spirit of Pagan Rome; but when that should be taken away by the conversion of the Pagan emperors, when the tide of riches and worldly glory, of fashion and vanity, should flow into the church, then would the iniquity work and brew, ferment and spread, until the lump should become leavened with the "leaven of the Pharisees," and all, but the few exceptions, be a mass of foul putridity, meet to be the prey of the spiritual vulture who was foreshowed. I say the mystery of iniquity was working in the apostle's time, but it was not to be destroyed until the coming of the Lord. (ver. 7, 8.)

This is a wonderful prophecy, and wonderful has been the accordance of the church in its application ever since the time that it became applicable, if, indeed, I should say that such an accordance is *wonderful*. The real wonder would be, if there were any popular misapprehension about its scope.

Clear as, I am sure, my readers will admit the above to be, everything like a ground for doubt or hesitation is done away by revelations still more distinct. In what has been stated, a huge monster is brought before the apprehension of the reader. His dimensions are

seen to be vast; the period of his devastations long; the field which he strews with carnage wide; but he must be ascertained by distinct features. Mahommedanism is a monster—infidelity is a monster, there must be marks and tokens which shall establish the identity of the great monster in question; or, to drop symbolical language, reason, that it may be satisfied, requires to be supplied with such details of the foretold evil as may free us from any doubt on the subject of what is meant. Now these details the very same apostle gives us farther on. In 1 Timothy iv., he introduces the subject of the coming Apostasy afresh, and gives us such particulars with respect to it as sets every question at rest. He tells us two remarkable peculiarities of the great antichristian system. It should inculcate and enforce—First, vows of celibacy, “forbidding to marry:” secondly, it should inculcate and enforce vows of poverty, “commanding to abstain from meats.” The admirable Joseph Mede forcibly argues that the word “meats” here, as in other parts of Scripture, does not merely mean flesh meats, but that it stands as our “daily bread” does in the Lord’s Prayer for all the necessities of life; and, consequently, that the above-mentioned mark of the Apostasy in Timothy indicates that it should be distinguished by enforcing on its votaries the renunciation of all sorts of property. Can we fail then in recognising, in these two particulars, the monkish celibacy and poverty of the Papal system? I would not by this application of the latter mark exclude its very pointed applicability to those contemptible distinctions of meats, by which Popery reduces to the condition of a grovelling subserviency, her wretched dupes, inducing them to think that the Almighty God can be conciliated by the use of a prescribed dietary, and that He can look upon men with greater or less favour (I speak it with reverence) according as they eat cod and cockle-sauce or mutton chops.

Popery has endeavoured to get out of the very obvious condemnation in which this passage would involve it, by stating that what the passage aims at is the early heresy of the Manichees and Gnostics; but the Holy Spirit has rendered the cavil an absurdity, by embodying in the prophecy a declaration that it should be applicable, not at the early period in which those ancient heretics prevailed, but “in the latter times.” (verse 1.)

The prophecy under consideration, however, fixes the brand in a manner still more ample. They were to apostatise from the faith, “giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils,” or, as the original has it, “doctrines of (*i. e.* concerning) demons.” And the word “demons” in the Scripture use of it, as may be proved, means the spirits of deceased persons. How clearly does this characteristic denote Popery. Look at its mass books, its breviaries, its “Manuals of Devotions,” its “Keys of Heaven,” its “Garden of the Soul,” its “Paths to Paradise,”—consider the prayers contained in these books, the spirit of the worship which they would produce or further, and you will perceive that the mind influenced by them is altogether turned away from God to the saints; and of the thousands of supplica-

tions which they contain, mark out those addressed to God, and you will find that they constitute an exceedingly diminutive fraction of the whole. I care nothing at all about the contemptible cavillations by which the Popish advocate would strive to get rid of this argument. He would say the books are not authorised, they are merely the compilations of pious individuals, the church is not responsible for them—to all such objections I would reply, the books are *popular*; they denote the prevalent opinion in your church. I care not who may be responsible for that opinion, there it is; such is your church, whatever may have made it so; and when I find that such the great Apostasy was to be, the identity quite satisfies my mind, and the rather, inasmuch as I am perfectly able to demonstrate, that the simple abandonment of the Scriptural doctrine of justification by faith alone, must necessarily merge into that very development of darkness which saint worship is.

It is thus we must grapple with Popery. We must not condescend to make "points" against it. It is the spirit of the thing that we must take, contrast it with the spirit of the true religion, and hold both up to the public gaze. Who would think of allowing a robber or a murderer, whose depredations and bloody-mindedness afflicted the whole community, to get off victorious, and laugh at the tribunals, because he could make a parade of acts of benevolence effected through the instrumentality of those spoils of which he had plundered his neighbours? The spirit of Popery is that of rank idolatry; foul, gross, and abominable, so much more dangerous than the worship of Fo, Budh, or Juggernaut, in that it is more subtle in its character. I can easily conceive that God out of heaven looking down on Irish Popery, and on the awful profanities, immoralities, and cruelties of the Brahmins and of the Thugs, may regard with a greater amount of abhorrence the former than the latter. The system of Pagan idolatry is practised in defiance of his power, and in the absence of his Word living and written; but Popery to all its monstrous soul-degrading and soul-destroying delusions, adds the frightful blasphemy of recommending them by divine authority, by which authority also it pretends that the Pope and his church have a power that is paramount to that of the Word itself. No, we must never allow ourselves to be brought into an oblivion of the real spirit of the system by accidents connected with it.

With the most perfect contentment would I submit the Protestantism of our church, or the religious writings of its most ultra-Protestant members, to a test similar to that by which I would try Popery. Gather together the books of devotion used by our people; their books of family or private prayer, their hymn books, Week's Preparations, and so forth, and mark the spirit which they all breathe. Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, three persons in one God, alone are exalted and glorified; man is abased; Christ is held forth as the sole Mediator; the Holy Spirit as the life-giving Sanctifier; to none but God is the note of praise sounded forth—the language of supplication or the incense of human worship offered up; and as the result and the accompaniment of all this, the heart of man is thrown open, candour,

and simplicity, and truth, sincere love, and unpretending benevolence abound; no dark tribunals are instituted; no directories of the conscience established, that "put darkness for light, and light for darkness, bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter;" but in the glorious light and air of heaven, the children of men walk abroad safely, and breathe freely, and a right standard of religion being elevated, reason and truth on every subject enjoy their legitimate supremacy.

The passage before referred to (1 Timothy iv.) does not merely give those details of the predicted evil already mentioned; but it describes the character of the men who should introduce and extend the great delusion. It paints them as "speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron;" (ver. 2;) and when a little further on it raises the warning voice against "profane and old wives' fables;" it clearly indicates to us that the coming Apostasy should be contemptible for a credulity that would drink in and swallow down without hesitation those lying legends for which superstition is ever infamous.

I think I cannot better illustrate the statement just made than by giving an account of "Saint Philomene." I derive my information from a little work that is very popular in Ireland, it bears the following title:—"The Life and Miracles of SAINT PHILOMENE, virgin and martyr, whose sacred body was lately discovered in the Catacombs at Rome, and from thence transferred to Mugnano, in the kingdom of Naples. Translated from the French. Second edition, accurately revised. Dublin: printed by William Powell, 68, Thomas-street, 1841." It is introduced by the following commendatory document:—

APPROBATION.

"The present work being extracted from larger works printed in Italy with the approbation of the ecclesiastical authority, and having been examined by theologians worthy of our confidence, we permit the printing and circulation of it in our diocese, referring, however, on this matter, to the declarations of the author, and especially to the decree of Urban VIII. We believe, moreover, after the example of many of our colleagues in the episcopacy, that we second the designs of Divine Providence by recommending to the faithful of our diocese the devotion to the blessed Thaumaturga, Philomene, virgin and martyr, persuaded that it will produce, as it has done elsewhere, the most abundant fruits of sanctification.

"Given at Friburg, in our Episcopal House, the 14th of July, 1834.

"X PETER TOBIAS,
"Bishop of Lausanne and Geneva.

"J. X. FONTANA,
"Chancellor of the Bishopric."

Perhaps some of my readers may not be aware that Dublin abounds in a species of warehouses that would be quite unnecessary in a Protestant city. In these repositories there are vended the numerous "tools" by which a pious Papist hopes "to work out his salvation."

I can scarcely illustrate the subject better than by giving, "bodily," an advertisement taken from the "Catholic Registry" for 1844. This I do without charging Miss Dowling anything for the publication.

FOREIGN VESTMENTS, GOLD AND SILVER LACE, THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS BOOKS,

ITALIAN AND FRENCH ENGRAVINGS, PORCELAIN VASES,
FONTS, AND STATUES,
IVORY AND BRONZE CRUCIFIXES, BEADS, MEDALS, &c., &c.
WARE-ROOMS (FIRST FLOOR), 7, ESSEX-BRIDGE,

(Next house but one to the Catholic Book Society.)

MISS DOWLING,

IN returning thanks to the Catholic Prelates, Clergy, and Gentry, for their distinguished patronage, respectfully acquaints them that she has just returned from Paris, Brussels, and Antwerp, where she has made extensive purchases. Her ware-rooms will be found to contain an assortment of Vestments and Church Ornaments, which, for richness, variety, and moderate prices, cannot be equalled in this kingdom.

MISS DOWLING is constantly supplied with an extensive and elegant assortment of the following Articles, at moderate prices :

ALTAR ORNAMENTS.

Rich and Plain Vestments.
Do. lined with Black and Violet.
High Mass Suits, in Gold and Silver Cloth.
Copcs and Benediction Veils.
Embroidered, Erocaded, and Plain Stoles.
Lace, Cambric, and Muslin Surplices.
Lawn and Linen Albs, and Cinctures.
Embroidered Mitres.
Do. in Gold and Silver Cloth and Tissue.
Cambric, Lawn, and Lace Rochets.
Cassocks, in Silk and Tabinet.
Pontifical Shoes, Gloves, and Cinctures.
Altar Linens, Cinctures, and Antependiums.
Soutannes, in Valentia, Cloth, and Stuff.
Caps and Stocks.
Chalice, Oil-stock, and Pyx covers.
Altar Charts, in Sheet, Boards, and Framed.
Tabernacles made to order.
Do. for Pyx and Oil-stocks.
Black Copcs and Palls.
Holy-water Fonts and Asperges.
Silver and Brass Crosses for beads.
Silver and Brass Reliquaries.
Painted and gilt Porcelain Fonts.
Do. in Bronze, Ivory, and Ebony.
Cocoa Cases for Beads.
Altar Bread Boxes.
Registers for Breviaries and Prayer Books.
Gold and Silver Lace and Fringe.
Gold and Silver Stole Tassels.
Carved, Gilt, and Mahogany Book Stands.

Altar Cruets, in Porcelain, Glass, and Plated.
Musical and Plain Altar Bells.
Stamps and Cutters for Altar-breads.
Ivory, Bronze, and Silver Crucifixes.
Silver Oil-stocks, and Pyx Cases.
Altar Candlesticks, richly gilt.
Imitation Spring Candles.
Best Wax and Spermaceti do.
Do. Candlemas and Paschal do.
Vases richly gilt, with Inscriptions.
Artificial Flowers for do.
Religious Statues, in gilt and plain Porcelain.
Wax Images for Cribbs.
Beads for Religious Communities.
Serge and Veiling for do.
Leather Cinctures and Rings.
Gold and Silver Rings made to order.
Cornelian, Coral, Fruit, and Agate Beads.
Do. chained in Silver, and Silver Decades.
Large and small Cocoa Beads.
First Communion and Confirmation Medals.
Large and small Medals of Saints.
Imitation Gold Lace and Fringe.
White and Yellow Orris and Fringe.
Gold, Silver, and Imitation Spangles.
Purl and Twists for Embroidering.
Embroidered Ciborium Covers.
Gold and Silver Lambs, Doves, and Pelicans.
Vestments made from the most approved patterns.

Such merchandize as that which is here ventilated, (when we consider that all is intended for "sacred" use,) may suggest to many, thoughts about Popery not devoid of weight and importance. Talk of benefitting a people besotted to the degree, that they can regard such a trumpety announcement, not only without contempt, but with respect! You might as well dream of elevating to greatness and dignity, a community of schoolboys in their nonage. Bad as infidelity is, it is positively an advance upon the puerilities, or rather the babyism, of the papal system.

However, among the favourite pictures vended by Miss Dowling and her "brother chips," or, perhaps, rather, her "sister chips"—for appropriately enough, this trade is generally followed by the female sex—is that of our "saint," Philomene.

Some time ago I had the pleasure of meeting with an old friend, a clergyman of our church, who had been travelling on the continent, and who had spent a considerable time in the Papal states. He informed me, that at that time all Italy was in an actual ferment, through the excitement caused by the worship of this new "saint;" that her image was to be seen in all places, with hundreds of devotees prostrated before it, while there was no end of the miracles attributed to her.

Now, I venture to say, that there is no rational Christian man, who will consider the statements made with respect to this supposed saint, who will not be constrained to admit that they afford the clearest evidence that the whole history from beginning to end involves a lie ridiculously transparent. He will agree with me in believing, that there never was any such saint at all—I question whether he will not go further, and insist that no such being as Philomene ever existed—that the narrative was got up for the mere purpose of bringing money into the coffers of a priest; that the reception of it implies the deepest moral degradation on the part of its recipients, and shows them to be utterly unsuited in their present state for constitutional liberty or privilege. But I must not stop here; the thing must be spiritually considered, and I will ask the man who thus considers it, to declare, whether he can conceive it possible to offer a greater insult to the God of Truth, than that which is involved in looking for his favour through the intercession of one who certainly never had a more substantial existence than Tom Jones, Parson Adams, the Vicar of Wakefield, Nicholas Nickleby, Martin Chuzzlewit, Barnaby Rudge, or any other of the heroes and heroines of Romance. There is just this difference between the characters in the novels and her saintship, that in the former there is, at least, a tribute rendered to common sense and the intellect of mankind; there is an effort to keep clear of anything that would shock probability; whereas the great merit of the history of the saint seems to be, that it sets probability at defiance. There is no doubt but that the very essence of miracles is, that they are naturally impossible; but all the Scripture miracles come recommended to us by the greatness of the occasion to which they were subservient. There

is a dignity connected with them, which, however infidels may sneer, has ever subdued anything resembling popular infidelity, or given to that infidelity, should it unhappily have existed, such a character of frenzy and madness as to render its verdict, in a matter of truth and falsehood, a mere nullity. Not so, however, the miracles of our saint. They imply such a prevalent delusion, they are so evidently lies, and worse than lies—humbug, that they cannot be broached in a popular assembly, as I have again and again experienced, without exciting roars of laughter.

With these few introductory remarks, I proceed to my subject.

The writer of the little book informs us, that he borrows his materials from a work written on the "saint," by Don Francis de Lucia, who recommends it by an introduction, explanatory of the immense and sudden spread of the reputation and worship of "Philomene," whom he designates, "Thaumaturga," *i.e.* the "great miracle worker." He quotes the language of Don Francis, thus:—His own comment is so edifying, that I give the whole passage :

"The greatest miracle, undoubtedly, of all which the Lord has wrought in favour of the holy martyr, is the astonishing rapidity with which her veneration has been propagated. Like the light, that in a few instants bounds over the measureless space between heaven and earth, the name of Saint Philomene, particularly since the miraculous (and well-proved) sweat [!!!] which was seen, in 1823, upon one of her statues, erected in the church of Mugnano, has reached in a few years to the ends of the world. The books that speak of her miracles; the images representing her, have been carried by zealous missionaries into China, into Japan, and to several Catholic establishments in America and in Asia. In Europe devotion towards her is extending, not only in the country and in the villages, but also in the most celebrated and populous cities. The great and the humble, the shepherds and their flocks, unite in doing her honour. At their head are seen cardinals, archbishops, bishops, heads of religious orders, and ecclesiastics, deserving consideration by their dignities, their learning, and virtue. From the Christian pulpit the most eloquent orators publish her glory; and all the faithful, who know her, in the kingdom of Naples particularly, and in the neighbouring countries, where there are millions of them, give to her with common accord the name of Thaumaturga. This," continues the same author, "which we see, we touch, as it were, with the hand, and which might be called the most wonderful of the miracles, makes us hope that one day, which day is perhaps not far distant, the glorious name of St. Philomene will hold a distinguished place in the Roman Martyrology, and the universal church will render to her a solemn devotion."

The hope of the author appears to be well founded. Already in 1827, the keeper of the holy relics, Monsignor Filippo Ludovici, presented to his holiness Pope Leo XII., a copy of the second edition of the work of Don Francis de Lucia. In consequence of what the celebrated missionary, Don Sauveur Pascali, who was present, said, the Vicar of Jesus Christ, after running rapidly over the work, and having asked many questions to Monsignor Ludovici concerning the miracles wrought through the holy martyr, appeared impressed with a high admiration for her; and at the same time, praising God for the power which he had given her, he blessed, in the most affectionate terms, the persons who, under the protection of this *great saint*, (these are his words,) consecrated themselves, though in the midst of the world, to the practice of perfection.

From that time the number of the devout towards St. Philomene is daily multiplied in the very centre of Catholicity. I have myself witnessed in 1832, and have

seen with my own eyes, in the pomp displayed in the *fetes* celebrated in her honour, persons who had received from her the most signal favour. The following are extracts from two letters written from the same city by a trustworthy person, the one dated April 4, and the other, May 20, 1834: "Our St. Philomene does not cease to perform prodigies at Rome, at Ancona, at Ferrara, at Naples, and at Florence. In the last-named city, the Rev. P. F., who was preaching the lent to the court of the Grand Duke, made the panegyric of the young Thaumaturga. Her devotion is extending visibly. At Caravita we have a superb picture of the saint; and we shall soon have her chapel. Every day they make of her new engravings."

"The good St. Philomene continues to obtain all sorts of favours for those who are devout towards her. To describe here the cures and other miraculous favours obtained by her intercession, would be to compose some volumes. At Rome are seen, exposed in several churches, her picture and her relics. The people go in crowds to pay them veneration—they make prayers of nine days—three days, &c. Encourage and propagate devotion to the young Thaumaturga: you will receive from it, both for yourself and for others, peculiar graces and favours."

I ought also to add, as I have heard myself in Italy, that a great number of bishops, both in the kingdom of Naples and the Papal States, have ordered in their dioceses, that a public devotion should be rendered to the saint, and their clergy say the mass of her, and recite the office. "It is," says the above-cited author, "a debt of gratitude which they have contracted, and which they have desired to discharge, for the benefits which the saint has bestowed abundantly on their flocks."

May this work, then, which I cast, like the last farthing of the widow, into the treasury of the glorious martyr, draw upon me a look of her benevolence, and contribute to the propagation of her devotion, as well as to the manifestation of her power, in the places where her name and her glory are yet unknown.

Can anything be more deplorable than the fatuity which would derive from the rapid extension of popular delusion and idolatry, an argument in favour of the foundation on which they rest. Having thus, however, commended the fiction by the extensive credence given to it, he proceeds in the first chapter to give us an account of "the discovery of the body of St. Philomene." I shall give the passage, merely entreating my readers to keep in mind that it was in condescension to the infamous system—the soul-destroying system of hateful delusion and deceit, which propagates the lies set down in this history, that the ministers of the Crown of England—traitors to the welfare of the people and the throne—lavished the national money in support of the den of ignorance, yea, and its well-spring too, at Maynooth.

The blessed body of St. Philomene was found in 1802, on the 25th of May, during one of those annual excavations which are usually made at Rome, in those places which have been rendered sacred by the burial of the martyrs. Those excavations took place this year in the catacombs of St. Priscilla, on the new *Sabrian* way. The first thing discovered was the sepulchral stone, which was remarkable for its singularity. It was of baked earth, and distinguished by several symbols, bearing allusion to virginity and martyrdom. They were cut with a transverse line, formed by an inscription, of which the first and last letters appeared to have been effaced by the instruments of the workmen, when endeavouring to detach it from the tomb: it was conceived in these words:

(FI) LUMENA, PAX TECUM FI (AT).*

The learned Father Parthenio, S. J., ["Society of Jesus;"] very probably the

* Filumena, peace be with thee, Amen.

"learned Father" had the whole thing manufactured under his own direction,] thinks that the two last letters, FI, ought to be united to the first word of the inscription, according to the usage of the ancients, which he says was common to the Chaldeans, Phœnicians, Arabs, Hebrews; and he adds, there are some traces of it to be found even amongst the Greeks. But the discussions on this point must be left to the learned, and it will be sufficient for us to observe, with the same learned Father, that, "on sepulchral stones, placed by the Christian upon the tombs of the martyrs who confessed Jesus Christ in the first persecution; in place of the formula, *In pace*, generally more used, they put *Pax tecum* which is something more lively and more animated."

The stone having been removed, the sacred relics of the holy martyr appeared, and close beside, an earthen vase of extremely thin material, one-half of it broken, and the sides encrusted with dried blood. The blood, a sure sign of the sort of martyrdom which terminated the days of St. Philomene, had been, according to the practice of the primitive church, collected by pious Christians. When the Christians could not themselves perform this office of devotion, they had recourse to the Pagans, and sometimes even to the executioners of their brethren, in order to have, together with their venerable remains, their sacred blood, offered so generously to him, who, upon the cross, sanctified, by the effusion of his own blood, the sacrifices, the pains, and the death of his children.

Whilst they were engaged in detaching from the different pieces of the broken vase, the blood that adhered to them, and that, with the greatest care, they gathered in a crystal urn the small particles, the persons present, amongst whom were some men of talent and cultivated minds, were astonished in seeing sparkle, [!!!] all on a sudden, the urn upon which their eyes were fixed. They drew nearer; they viewed at leisure the wonderful phenomenon, and with sentiments of the most lively admiration, joined to the most profound respect, blessed God, "who is glorified in his saints." The sacred particles, in falling from the vase into the urn, were transformed into various precious and shining bodies; [!!!] some presenting the lustre and colour of the purest gold, some of silver, some appearing like diamonds, rubies, emeralds, and other precious stones; so that in place of the matter, of which the colour, in detaching it from the vase, was brown and dark, they saw only in the crystal the mingled brilliancy of different colours, like those that shine in the rainbow.

The witnesses of this prodigy were not men to doubt of what they had seen with their eyes, and examined with attention; they knew that God, particularly to those whom, in heaven, he loads with the riches of his glory, is not so sparing of his gifts as that a like miracle could cost him much. They considered it, not only in itself, as a shadow of that heavenly brightness promised in the sacred writings to the body and soul of the just; *Fulgebunt justi sicut sol...et tanquam scintille*.—(Wisdom, iii. 7); [The just shall shine as the sun...and as sparks,] but also in the happy and salutary effects which it produced in their hearts. They felt their faith revive, and had they desired to compare the present and the past, they might have recalled to mind, to justify their pious belief, many similar facts; that, for example, of St. John Nepomucene, whose body having been cast into the Muldau, was distinguished in the midst of the waters, during the night, by the brilliant light which clothed it like a garment. What is told of St. Philomene is certainly more wonderful, but yet, how far short of that miracle, of which it is the figure and the pledge, the resurrection of the body, when the elect shall be transformed into the glory of Jesus Christ!

In reading the foregoing, one must be struck with admiration at the permanence of this miraculous transformation. At the present time it excites the wonder of all who go to venerate the sacred relics. They see also, in the same urn, the same brilliant bodies, but their brilliancy has not always the same liveliness, and the colours with which they shine have at different moments different shades: at one time it is the appearance of the ruby, at another that of the emerald that predominates; again, their brilliancy is at times as it were tarnished by a light layer of ashes. Once only it was observed to disappear, and the terrified eyes of those who

witnessed it saw, in the sacred urn, but a little ordinary earth. But this new miracle terminated, as soon as the unworthy eyes of a person, who shortly afterwards died suddenly, had ceased to profane the holiness of the venerable relics. [!!!!] O God, how the display of thy power is at the same time amiable and terrible !

A difficulty may here present itself to the reader's mind. This prodigy, as we have called it, took place first at the moment of the extraction of the holy body from the catacombs ; the eye-witnesses must have spoken of it, and consequently it must have made a noise in Rome ; how then has it happened, that, from the 25th of May, 1802, until almost the middle of 1805, an object so worthy of all respect should, instead of being exposed upon the altars to receive the homage of the faithful, have been kept concealed and confounded with several other bodies of holy martyrs, which it had not pleased the Lord to honour in so singular a manner ? But let us reflect on and admire the wise slowness, and the supernatural, as it were, circumspection of the Court of Rome, when called upon to pronounce on these extraordinary events. Let us meditate particularly on the views of Providence in regard of these sacred remains, and the difficulty will disappear. Yes ; God wished as all that has since happened concurs to prove, that this new sun, like the morning, after having shed the first light, should remain some time longer under the clouds.

The second chapter is headed, "The History of the Martyrdom of St. Philomene." This "history" is given in most minute detail. The birth, and birth-place, the parentage, and the extraordinary adventures of the "saint," with the exact day of her "martyrdom," are brought before us. How discovered ? In the pages of some ancient author ? Not at all. They were revealed "to three different persons." The following are the words of our historian :—

It is well to remark, 1st, that these revelations have been to three different persons, of whom the first is a young artisan, very well known to Don Francis de Lucia, who, in his work, spread by thousands of copies in the kingdom of Naples and the surrounding states, renders public testimony to the purity of his conscience and to his solid piety. The second is a zealous priest, now a canon, for whom the devotion to the holy martyr, of whom he was the perpetual panegyrist, procured the most singular favours. The third is one of those virgins consecrated to God in an austere cloister, about thirty years of age, and living at Naples. 2nd. These three persons were unknown to each other ; they have never had any communication, and inhabit countries far separated from each other. 3rd. The accounts which they have given, whether by word of mouth, or by writing, fully agree as to the basis and principal circumstances, and in no place contradict the epitaph which we have just explained, and give to it, by the details, an elucidation as clear as it is edifying. (p.p. 26, 27.)

My readers will, no doubt, perceive that the whole thing was the work of the Jesuits. The correspondence which they keep up with distant countries, and the variety of agency that they can command, explain the whole matter. Don Francis was the confederate, as I conjecture, of the holy brother who kept the bone repository at Rome, by whom, perhaps, the whole affair was contrived as a money-making speculation. That its obvious tendency is to bring into doubt the whole Christian revelation, and to promote infidelity, no reasonable person will question. The "epitaph" alluded to in the last extract, is certain symbols that were engraved on the tombstone of the "saint." "The first was an anchor ;" "the second an arrow ;" "the third,

almost in the middle of the stone, was a palm ; " underneath which, there was represented a kind of lash made of thongs of leather, loaded with lead." " After these were two arrows, so arranged, that the first pointed upwards, and the other in a contrary direction." " Lastly, a lily appeared, the symbol of innocence and virginity." (p.p. 24-26.) These very slender materials for a biography, with the inscription before mentioned, alone were in writing; they were, however, filled up and developed by "the revelations." "The artisan" received his information in the way of a vision: the "saint" herself appeared to "the priest" one day as he was walking in the country; but the most circumstantial "revelation" which, in fact, involved and included the others, was that made to "the nun."

It seems that the saint appeared to this nun, whom she had previously delivered "from temptations of mistrust and impurity." To these attacks of Satan "St. Philomene had made to succeed the sweetness of joy and peace." And upon the devotions of the nun towards her deliverer being increased, she experienced a proportionate increase of her favour. The nun had in her cell a little statue of the "saint." "Miraculous alterations began to be remarked in the face of this same statue." This circumstance led to its more public exhibition in the chapel of the community to which the nun was attached, and to a more pious reverence towards the saint. The enthusiasm of the nun was more especially kindled; and as she was on one occasion engaged in her prayers before the statue, "all on a sudden her eyes were closed in a manner that she was unable to open them, and a voice full of sweetness, which appeared to come from where the statue was, addressed her." Of course it was the saint herself. This was but the beginning of a series of utterances, during which she revealed to the nun her strange eventful history.

"My dear sister," said she, "I am the daughter of a prince who governed a small state in Greece. My mother was also of royal blood, and as they were without children, and they both still idolaters, in order to obtain children they continually offered to their false God sacrifices and prayers." These prayers proved vain. However, a doctor from Rome, named Publius, seeing the affliction of the King and Queen, and pitying their "blindness, by the impulse of the Holy Ghost spoke to them of the Christian faith, and promised them posterity if they would only consent to receive baptism." They acted on the advice of this friend, and the birth of "Philomene" was the reward of their conversion. On the day of her baptism, "they called her Filumena, or, daughter of light (*filia luminis*)." Having grown up, the daughter made a vow of perpetual celibacy. "She dedicated her virginity to Jesus Christ." But it happened that her parents made a journey to Rome, and were introduced, with their daughter, to the Emperor Dioclesian, who overcome by the charms of the damsel, demanded her hand from the King, her father, in marriage. "I shall place at your disposal," said the Emperor, "all the force of the empire, and shall ask in return only one thing, that is the hand of your daughter."

The father, delighted with the prospect of such an alliance, concluded that he had only to broach the matter to his daughter, in order to ensure compliance. But "Philomene" was inexorable. "My virginity," said she, "belongs to Christ; I can no longer dispose of it." The queen, her mother, was as much provoked with this decision as was her father, but their joint efforts failed in altering the resolve of the inflexible young lady. "No, no," said she to them, "God and that virginity which I have vowed to him, before every thing—before you, before my country!" She was brought to the emperor, who, on his part, did all in his power to win her, but his promises and threats were equally useless. He then got into a violent fit of anger, and threw the object of his admiration, loaded with chains, into prison. But the Virgin Mary, "the queen of virgins, holding her divine son in her arms," appeared to the lovely prisoner; refreshed her bodily weakness, and confirmed her spiritual resolves. The emperor then took the resolution of having her publicly tortured, and, in the first place, condemned her to be scourged. He had her beaten with such violence that her "body, bathed in blood, appeared but one single wound." In this state he had her dragged back to prison, but "two angels" appeared to her, and "pouring a health-giving balm" over her wounds, renewed her strength, and rendered her beauty still more dazzling. When Dioclesian heard this, his fury knew no bounds. He commanded an "anchor to be tied to her neck, and that she should be buried in the waters of the Tiber." The moment she was precipitated into the river "two angels came" to her "succour, and having cut the rope" which bound her to the anchor, "the anchor fell to the bottom of the Tiber, where it has remained to the present time." While they transported her "gently, in the view of an immense multitude, to the banks of the river."

This miracle converted a number of the spectators, but only hardened Dioclesian. He then ordered that she should be "shot with a shower of arrows." "Stuck all over" with them, her "blood flowed on all sides;" and she was again carried "back to her dungeon." But "heaven honoured" her with "new favour;" she "fell into a sweet sleep," and found herself on awaking "perfectly cured." The Emperor, "in a fit of rage," commanded her a second time to be pierced with sharp darts. The archers hastened to obey him. With all their strength they bent their bows; but the arrows "refused to second their intentions:" they fell harmless to the ground. The Emperor, "enraged at the sight," called her a magician; and, thinking that the action of fire could destroy the enchantment, he ordered the darts to be made red in a furnace, and directed a second time against his lady-love." "It was done indeed," says the saint; "but these darts, after having gone over a part of the space which they were to cross to come to me, took quite a contrary direction, and returned to strike those by whom they had been hurled; six of the archers were killed by them!!!!!! and several among them renounced Paganism." At length the people began to murmur at the cruelty of the tyrant, who hastened to termi-

nate the days of Philomene, and ordered her head to be cut off. "Thus did my soul," said she, "take flight towards my heavenly Spouse; who placed me with the crown of virginity and the palm of martyrdom in a distinguished rank amongst the elect, who partake of the enjoyment of his divine presence. The day that was so happy for me, and saw me enter into glory, was a Friday, and the hour of my death was the third after mid-day, (that is to say, the same hour that saw my divine Master expire.)"

The barefaced extravagance of the above recital will astonish such Protestants as may not previously have seen it. The superfluity of impudence which it indicates on the part of the authors, and gullibility on the part of those who swallowed their story, suggests a state of society in the very lowest degree of mental decrepitude. Fools in point of principle, it is little wonder that they are slaves in reality. They must be devoid of the spirit, not merely to assert liberty for themselves, but even to conceive its nature or realize its importance. Yet such is the condition of the Roman Catholic people of Ireland. Legends as gross are popular through every Popish part of the country. That Irish Protestant has no title to the name of patriot who does not expend his labour and his money, employ his talent and his prayers to break the shackles which enthrall and degrade his fellow-countrymen.

The third chapter of the book is entitled "Translation of the Relics of St. Philomene to Mugnano;" and it abounds with statements not less extravagant than the preceding. One of the devotees of the saint was at great expense in providing an altar of marble to stand before the image of the saint. On the great marble slab that covered this altar, there are "still visible the marks of a miracle. The workman, in using his chisel to fit it into its place split it in nearly the whole of its breadth. A number of persons were present, and it may be imagined what trouble was felt by them, and what confusion by the workman. He was, notwithstanding this accident, very expert in his art, and feeling humbled by this awkwardness he set himself to mend the breach. The breach was at the beginning more than a finger wide; he endeavoured to unite the edges by means of a plate of iron, and then filled the opening with cement. The *finger of the saint* aiding the hand of the workman by a wonderful miracle, joined in its former state the marble that had been separated in so remarkable a manner. She left merely, at the place where it had been split, a line of a deep colour, which might be taken for a vein in the stone by a person unacquainted with the miracle."

It were utterly superfluous to comment on the infatuation which here challenges the contempt and pity of the reader.

The fourth chapter is headed, "Miracles Wrought in Favour of Children." To one of these children, who was called by her name, the saint appeared, and "gave her some sweetmeats," saying, "My little

Philomene take courage; tell your mamma that she must weep no more, that I will cure you."

To a poor woman near her confinement, who had not means of providing clothes for her offspring, the saint likewise appeared, bringing with her a "bundle of neat and elegant clothes, arranged with order!" From these there issued "so sweet an odour that the air was embalmed with it." The woman "took the treasure and kissed it, and was unable to express her gratitude to her heavenly benefactress." "The news of the miracle spread abroad, and persons came from all quarters to kiss the wonderful clothes and breathe the heavenly perfume they exhaled."

It would be too great a trespass on the patience of the reader to prolong extracts embodying so much extravagance. Enough has been given to illustrate the deplorable superstition which the Church of Rome originates and fosters. I shall, therefore, conclude by one or two quotations from the seventh and last, and longest chapter of the book, the title of which chapter is "Practices of Devotion in Honour of St. Philomene." The absurdity of what follows will scarcely excite a smile when the frightful blasphemy which it involves, is considered.

The heart, particularly in matters connected with prayer, desires a holy liberty. God comprehends all languages. We know, however, that he prefers a fervent briefness to long prayers which do not animate true devotion. It would be, perhaps, better to let each one determine the time and the form of his prayers; but, as we do not pretend to impose laws upon any one, it may be permitted us to trace out a little plan, which people may adopt if they wish, in performing either the three days' prayers, or the novena (nine days' devotion) in honour of St. Philomene.

1st. Ornament as well as you can a little oratory, and place in it an image or relic of the saint; both if you have them.

2ndly. During this time, keep, if you can, a lamp continually lighted before the image or relic. This will be, as it were, a mark of your devotion and of your confidence in the saint; your heart, of which it will be the symbol, will animate it with the breath of a living faith. More than one miracle has been wrought by means of the oil of these lamps.

3rdly. If you perform two exercises during the day, you will be able, during the first, to meditate on some one of the virtues and miracles of St. Philomene; and you will draw from them conclusions to be practised for the amendment of your heart and life. You will conclude it by reciting the litany of the ever blessed Virgin, and repeat thrice the two verses, *Regina martyrum, Regina Virginum, ora pro nobis*. You will add at the end, "Pray for us, O St. Philomene, that we may be made worthy of the promises of Christ."

PRAYER.

Grant, O Lord, I beseech thee, that the Virgin and Martyr, St. Philomene, may solicit thy mercy for us. I implore her intercession, through the merits of her chastity, and by the glory that she gave to thy power in dying for thee. I beseech thee, O my God, through Jesus Christ, our Lord, who lives and reigns with thee eternally, in unity with the Holy Ghost. Amen. (pp. 95-7.)

After this there are given prayers to the "saint" for every day in the week. I select those for Tuesday and Thursday, as embodying a reference, perhaps, to the most extravagant, and, if possible,

to the most lying portion of this most superlatively lying history; and for an especial reason I give the Litany to the "saint" in full:—

FOR TUESDAY.

O courageous Martyr and most faithful Virgin of Jesus Christ! to preserve unsullied the treasure of purity and of faith in your God, you suffered yourself to be cast with an anchor tied to your neck into the waters of the Tiber, from which your heavenly Spouse delivered you unhurt; we claim your intercession, to the end that, in the midst of the waters of bitterness, of anxieties, and of tribulations, which unceasingly surround us, we may be supported with strength, and preserved from the shipwreck of our sins and from the death of our souls; and that we may not be sunk by the waters of temptation. Amen.

FOR THURSDAY.

O courageous Virgin! who, with a supernatural joy and invincible force, thrice sacrificed your virginal body, in order to persevere in the doctrine of Christ, and defended heroically your virginity and faith; who esteemed yourself happy to be three times pierced with darts; who received as many palms and crowns as your body did wounds, for your heavenly Spouse, pray for us who observe so indifferently the law of God; obtain for us the strength necessary to come to eternal salvation, to the end that we may bear with resignation the pains, the sorrows of this life, and that we may resist all the attacks of hell. Amen. (p.p. 109-111.)

LITANY IN HONOUR OF ST. PHILOMENE.

Lord, have mercy on us.

Christ, have mercy on us.

Lord, have mercy on us.

Christ, hear us.

Christ, graciously hear us.

God the Father, of heaven, have mercy on us.

God the Son, Redeemer of the world, have mercy upon us.

God the Holy Ghost have mercy on us.

Holy Trinity, have mercy on us.

Holy Mary, Queen of Martyrs,

St. Philomene, child of benediction,

St. Philomene, who wast the daughter of light,

St. Philomene, who from thy childhood chose Jesus Christ for thy Spouse,

St. Philomene, who despisedst with heroical courage the greatest honours, in order to continue faithful to Jesus Christ,

St. Philomene, whose faith and love for Jesus Christ, promises and threats could not change,

St. Philomene, whose constancy neither the entreaties of a father nor the tenderness of a mother could diminish,

St. Philomene, who for thy great love of God in sufferings, deservedst to be consoled by Jesus and Mary,

St. Philomene, whose eagerness to endure new torments daily increased,

St. Philomene, whom God entrusted to the guardianship of angels, and who, by their aid, many times overcamest the fury of thy persecutors,

St. Philomene, whose glory God has been pleased to manifest by continual miracles,

St. Philomene, who sufferedst many kinds of martyrdom in the various torments thou hadst to endure.

St. Philomene, whose example attracted many to the faith,

St. Philomene, who, like Jesus, was bound to a pillar and scourged,

St. Philomene, perfect model of Christian virgins,

Pray for us.

St. Philomene, who protectest in a particular manner those who honour thee,
 St. Philomene, whom the church honours and reveres as an illustrious Virgin and Martyr of Jesus Christ,
 St. Philomene, who enjoyest a never-ending glory,
 Lamb of God, who bearest away the sins of the world, forgive us, O Lord.
 Lamb of God, who bearest away the sins of the world, graciously hear us, O Lord.
 Lamb of God, who bearest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us, O Lord.
 (p.p. 113-115.)

Pray for us.

I protest I am lost in amazement! I quite want words to do justice to the astonishment, disgust, indignation, pity, anxiety, and pain, with which I am filled at the consideration of the whole of the above. God help Ireland, and enlighten the dark minds of its Roman Catholic inhabitants; and grant to all Irish Protestants a holy zeal against the abomination that maketh desolate, by which our island is destroyed. The best part of the above prayers is by far the worst of the whole. To mix up supplications to "the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world," with the flagitious trash that accompanies them; is so frightful an insult to the throne of heaven, that the blood runs cold at the consideration of it. Think of the feelings with which such prayers are heard by angels! Of the laughter that shakes the sides of hell—if they can laugh in hell—at this gross mockery of the Almighty! Think, at the same time, of the curse that must in consequence abide upon the countries involved in this blasphemy; and every Popish country is involved in it. The Church of Rome is one church, one society, one body, and if it be at its head in Italy so loathsome and monstrous, it will be in vain to plead that in enlightened England the Philomenean extravagancies are not carried to that extent to which they are abroad. Hear how our church through the Homilies speaks on the subject. Having in a tone of great indignation denounced the folly of certain Popish superstitions, with the intention of stirring up the hearers against the Church of Rome, it then plainly admits that these particular superstitions did not very much prevail in England; by this avowed teaching us that it is our duty faithfully to labour against Romish abomination, even though it may not particularly affect our own country or immediate neighbourhood. The following are the words of the Homily:—

"And what thing can be more superstitious, more foolish or ungodly, than that men, women, or children, should wear a friar's coat to deliver them from agues or pestilence? or when they die, or when they be buried, cause it to be cast upon them, in hope thereby to be saved? Which superstition, although (thanks be to God) it hath been little used in this realm, yet in divers other realms it hath been; and yet is used, among many, both learned and unlearned." (Homily on Good Works, Part III.)

Thus does our holy church stir up her children to zeal against Popery at home, by the consideration of its grossly idolatrous character abroad.

My own opinion, however, is, that there are votaries of Popery, at least in Ireland, who, in the degree of excess, to which they would carry their superstition, would not fall behind the most zealous of the admirers or worshippers of "Saint Philomene" who could be found within the precincts of Italy.

Let me, however, strive to realize to the apprehension of my readers the excessive criminality, as well as the folly, of connecting addresses to the Deity with any manner of devotion to so rubbish a "saint" as this fabulous Philomene, or to any other "saint," at all. This I shall endeavour to do, by supposing an association to adopt to our queen such an address as the following:—

"May it please your majesty,

"We, your majesty's most devoted and loyal subjects, most humbly pray, that your majesty may be pleased to relieve your majesty's petitioners in the following case, which grievously afflicts them.

"We deplore, may it please your majesty, the neglect that we suffer at the hands of the rich and of the great, and the oppression to which we are constantly subjected through their usurious avarice. As an example of our calamity, we humbly beg to inform your majesty, that a most excellent member of our body, and a most faithful subject of your majesty, Nicholas Nickleby by name, for a long course of years, together with his mother and his sister, was most grievously persecuted, injured, and afflicted, by his proud and oppressive uncle, Mr. Nickleby, senior, &c. &c.

"In further confirmation of the hardships we endure, we refer your majesty to the well-known and undeserved calamities and misfortunes of a highly meritorious youth; also, your majesty's most faithful subject, by name, Oliver Twist, &c. &c.

"We, your majesty's most loyal subjects, take the present opportunity also of expressing to your majesty the deep sense of gratitude which has been produced in us by the late appointments of your majesty. It would be impossible to express the satisfaction which your loyal subjects in Ireland derived from the information that your majesty had promoted the liberator of their country, Mr. Daniel O'Connell, to the situation of prime minister; Mr. Thomas Steele to the office of chief commissioner for the payment of the national debt; and town-councillor Bailly to that of keeper of the privy purse. To these distinguished individuals, enjoying, as they now do, your majesty's royal confidence, we refer for the proof of our allegations; and feeling convinced that they will plead our cause before your majesty, we entreat that your majesty will admit their advocacy, and thus graciously condescend to the humble prayer of your petitioners."

"And your petitioners will ever pray."

I admit, that, the illustration is a feeble one; but if such supplications would be grossly offensive to an earthly throne, and call forth

nothing but contemptuous rejection, how shockingly blasphemous must such litanies and such prayers as those above given, when addressed to the throne of the Omnipotent, be pronounced to be! Surely, in the view of those who allow themselves to be thus befooled by crafty priests, and of those priests themselves, we may well adopt the language of our church, "O wicked, impudent, and most shameless men, the devisers of these things! O silly, foolish, and dastardly daws, that believe such things! Now God be merciful to such miserable and silly Christians, who, by the fraud and falsehood of those who should have taught them the way of truth and life, have been made not only more wicked than the Gentile idolaters, but also no wiser than horses, asses, and mules, which have no understanding." (Homily on Peril of Idolatry, Part III.)

CHAPTER IX.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

It is by no means my intention at present, in full, to demonstrate the apostasy of the Church of Rome. My simple object is to give a brief outline of the process of demonstration—to point out what the nature and character of that demonstration would be, so as that my readers may be able, each for himself, to perceive its practicability.

I design, when this work is completed, to take up the subject referred to, and at large to develop the Scriptural proof of the apostasy of the Church of Rome. As above stated, I now merely intend to lay down the hypothesis that the Church of Rome is the great foretold Apostasy—to give a brief view of the line of argument by which it may be proved so—to show that such was the view of those who reformed our church; that it is in entire accordance with her doctrines and even matter of direct statement amongst them, and thus to infer the exact spiritual state of the modern Church of Rome, and consequently the proper mode of meeting its pretensions as a doctrinal institution, in whatever part of the world, (whether in Italy, or elsewhere,) it may lay claim to that character; this done, I will show its position in Ireland and the sister country, from all which it will be seen, that whether considered doctrinally or ecclesiastically, it is incapable of standing for one single moment in the person of the ablest champion against the weakest well-informed member of our church.

In the fourth chapter of the 1st Epistle to Timothy, as appeared before, the following marks of the apostasy, viz.: vows of celibacy, poverty, saint-worship, and lying legends, were exhibited as clearly realized in the Church of Rome. Satisfactory as this is, considered

as a demonstration of the point in question, the apostle supplies us with another proof on the matter, which, I confess, tells with greater power on my mind than any other whatsoever. The passage in Timothy, and the very extraordinary one in the 2nd Thessalonians, point at the Church of Rome. They, as it were, designate it, denominate it, single it out as the guilty thing. The other proof, however, to which I allude, is of a totally different character.

It is derivable from the whole spirit of St. Paul's Epistles: the Epistle to the Romans, to the Corinthians, to the Ephesians, to the Colossians, &c. &c. All through these admirable documents the man of God agonises, as it were, to give weight, force, and efficacy to one single point. He directs his accumulated energies to this, and correspondingly devotes himself, with all his might, to demolish the antagonistic principle.

The one point that he glorifies, exalts, and dwells upon is, "justification by faith alone, without the works of the law." The doctrine which he denounces with corresponding energy is the "justifying merit of works." His single object seems to be, to magnify Christ as the sole and only Saviour. He will hear of nothing else; he will admit of nothing else; he will tolerate nothing else but Christ—Christ alone—Christ and him crucified—Christ as the example—Christ as the atonement—Christ as the Mediator—Christ as the animating principle—Christ as the object of love and veneration—Christ as the "all." This is the principle for which the apostle contends; while, on the other hand, he denounces as diabolical, as detestable, as deserving of abhorrence and contempt, the doctrine that would add anything to Christ's finished work, that would require or allow anything beside him. The whole character of the apostle's writing is that of an enthusiast, for and against these two opposing doctrines. While he is engrossed with love and admiration of the one, he evidently loses all patience with the other. The Galatians had by no means renounced Christ, they were still zealous for his name; but they would add something to his work, they would do something to justify themselves beside what he had done. Observe how the apostle addresses them: "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you? This only would I learn of you, received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Are ye so foolish, &c. &c." (chap. iii.) "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another Gospel, which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the Gospel of Christ. But though we or an angel from heaven preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." (chap. i.) And then mark the contempt which he pours upon this counter-principle of a divided dependence. "Now, after that ye have known God, or

rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage. Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain." (chap. iv.) The feeling expressed in the above passage pervades every one of the Epistles of St. Paul; he evidently connects the slightest departure from the simple principle of justification by faith alone, with that sort of superstitious regard for mere ordinances which he thus denounces. While, therefore, he dwells upon the vast importance of a sole dependence upon Christ, he at the same time, with all his matchless energy, deprecates the "beggarly elements," which are certain to be developed when the simplicity of faith is in the slightest degree departed from. Observe how pointedly both ideas are brought before us in the Epistle to the Colossians: (chap. ii. :) "As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him: rooted and built up in him, and stablished in the faith, as ye have been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving. Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ: for in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power." (6—10.) Such is the strain in which he enlarges upon the great fundamental principle of the Gospel, closely connecting it everywhere with a mysterious operation of a supernatural sort; simultaneously wrought by the Holy Spirit upon the soul of the believer; carefully and laboriously insisting upon the counter truth, that if this simple faith be departed from, Christ is denied, the Holy Spirit expelled from the heart, light excluded, darkness rendered predominant—in short, the devil enthroned within that breast which should be the living temple of the Almighty; and instead of that energy of character which contemplates the conversion of the world, embraces the whole family of man with the arms of an engrossing charity, a mean and grovelling spirit of bondage produced, which terminates in nothing else than in the manufacture of a fund of merit, supposed to grow out of a base and paltry observance of ordinances. Mark how, a little further on, he develops the working of the false principle of justification. He does it in the way of a caution against those who would inculcate that false principle. "Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ. Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, and not holding the head, from which all the body by joints and bands, having nourishment ministered and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God. Wherefore, if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances (Touch not, taste not, handle not; which all are to perish with the using,) after the commandments

and doctrines of men? Which things have, indeed, a show of wisdom in, will-worship and humility, and neglecting of the body, (not in any honour,) to the satisfying of the flesh," (ver. 16--23.) Nothing can, to my mind, be more striking than this. Here, then, we find that the great business of this great apostle—his very mission, in fact, was to preach up the grand Gospel principle, that justification was by faith alone, and in opposition to it, to counteract and eradicate the legal spirit;—to prove that the former led to light, knowledge, and liberty; that the latter involved darkness, ignorance, and bondage; that the one realized to the world the presence, in the church, of God himself; and made him through his people the Regenerator and the Benefactor of all the families of the earth; that the other, gradually merged into a system of carnal ordinances, worshipping of angels, and those vain observances, which, indeed, puff up with a consciousness of their desert those who engage in them,—producing in them a gradual indifference to the sufficiency of Christ,—and issue in nothing else than the empty performances suggested by priestcraft, and properly denominated "will-worship;" that is, to say, a worship not prescribed by God, but originating in the perversities of the uncontrolled and unenlightened "will" of the unregenerate man.

I repeat, that this seems to me to be the most striking proof that Popery is the Apostasy; because it shows that its fundamental principle of the merit of works must necessarily result in all the other corruptions that are connected with the Papish system. Its gross errors brand it upon the very forehead with the marks of the foretold evil.

But its *subtle principle* of human merit, apparently so innocent and praiseworthy, so exceedingly plausible and flattering to the natural man, is here demonstrated to be a seed that must ultimately produce that moral upas tree, which kills with its deadly influence every living thing that would attempt to shelter itself beneath its shade.

This is that, apparently, which the apostle alludes to in the celebrated prophecy above quoted (2 Thess. ii.) "The mystery of iniquity doth already work" (ver. 7.) What was this mystery of iniquity? What else, save that very corruption of doctrine against whose "working" St. Paul struggled in every one of his Epistles, and whose development he so often stated to be, a system of ceremonial formalism, of religious vanity, of dazzling Pharisaism? Its "working" throughout his whole career seemed almost to break his heart; it was continually alienating from him his disciples, and seducing them into a line of conduct at variance with the "simplicity of Christ."—"The mystery of iniquity doth already work, only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way."—"It doth already work," said he, "but it is a cold, chilling, freezing principle; it draws man from God, and repels God from man; it does well enough for the rich, and the great, and the prosperous; but it has nothing in it to bind up the broken spirit, or to cheer the afflicted, or to comfort the disconsolate; and these are times of persecution and of sorrow." The rulers of the earth.

have drawn the sword against the disciples of our Master; the infuriated Nero having seized the followers of Christ, surrounds them with pitch barrels, and illumines his gardens with the flames of the torture of the faithful. This is not the time when there can be a complacency in the 'beggary elements' of legalism. To sustain them against the fires of the adversary, nothing less than an indwelling Spirit will suffice, and that can be had by faith alone: the persecutor, therefore, 'lets,' hinders, drives away the seducing heretic, the subtle apostate, who would supplant the merits of Christ by the supposed merits of the creature. So long as Rome is Pagan and persecuting, so long will the afflicted believer seek for his refuge within the arms of his Redeemer, and the 'workings of the Mystery of Iniquity,' be impeded; but when this impediment is taken away; when the Emperors embrace the faith; when ease, and affluence, and flattery, rather than persecution and death, become the award of the professor of Christianity, then will the legal admixture, the Pharisaical leaven, 'the Mystery of Iniquity' 'work' without hindrance. A gorgeous ceremonial, a pompous parade, a formal catalogue of human inventions, will supplant the faith which the fires of persecution made a living one; and the seductions of the world completing that apostasy which the spirit of the first born, Cain, could not enforce, will prepare the church to welcome the tyrant which its faithlessness will raise up, 'and then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the Spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming.'"

This is the *a priori* proof of the apostasy of the Church of Rome. It shows that the slightest addition to the work of justification which Christ wrought, makes Christ of none effect to him who thus contaminates that which Christ finished. (John xix. 30.) And if the work of Christ be made of none effect, then is the Holy Spirit excluded from the heart of man, darkness prevails instead of light, and the result of that darkness will be to flatter human nature by magnifying the addition, (which is always something of the nature of the meritoriousness of man,) until the accumulated addition utterly dishonours, degrades, and nullifies Christ himself.

In effect, what St. Paul denounces as "the mystery of iniquity," is the Popery of the human heart. He attacks the evil at its root; he demonstrates to us, that if once the principle of evil be admitted,—its beginning, its origination, in ever so infinitesimal a degree,—it will at last spread into all those enormities, and precisely *those* enormities, for which Popery is infamous.

This view of the matter will, perhaps, satisfy my readers as to the imprudence of persons who ground public opposition to such institutions as those of Maynooth College upon the gross character of the teaching that may be proved to exist in that seminary. They take its class-books, and they exhibit in these the justification of perjury, persecution, and moral corruption of almost every conceivable sort; and they would base upon *this* their demand for the withdrawal from the institution of national support. Now, admitting the truth of all their

charges, I contend that their opposition does not go anything at all like far enough. The nation is frightfully guilty in teaching the abominations of Popery; but it would not be innocent, it would not be praiseworthy, it would not deserve, nor could it expect, the blessing of God, until it had absolutely and completely eradicated the evil, and expelled its virus from this or any and every institution which it might endow with funds.

What a blaze of light does the progress of things at Oxford shed upon the view that I here lay down! Did I now for the first time declare that the principles of the Tractarians would lead to Popery open and avowed, it might be supposed that it was the lamentable issue of the Oxford movement—the wholesale perversions which, at this present moment, excite public attention—which induced me to make the assertion; but I have been incessantly proclaiming at public meetings, and in numerous addresses for years past, not that Tractarianism was an approximation to Popery, but the very thing itself.

That it is so, few will now, I dare say, be disposed to question. What Protestant, then, that has the welfare of society at heart, and that is really acquainted with his own principles, would endure that Mayhooth should be supported by the public money, if, purged of everything that is gross and offensive, it were established for the mere purpose of teaching the refined and sublimated Popery of the Tractarian school? If our church to-morrow became so deteriorated as, instead of its present principles of free grace, justification by faith, and the right of private judgment, to promulgate the doctrines of sacramental grace, justification by faith and works combined, and the nullity of private judgment, though its moral teaching were of the purest character, though it denounced perjury and persecution in every form, and studiously rejected the grosser features of Popery, it would be as absolutely Popish in its essence as the Church of Rome herself; and in due course it would rejoice in a tyrant at Canterbury, and blindly adopt every foul thing that disgraces Rome. Let us then strike at the root. Let our Reformers be our model, and let us not for a single moment imagine that we do our work completely, if we go no further than to elicit popular opposition to Roman *abominations*. Where is it that our church in her incomparable homilies first thunders against Popery? Is it when she comes to discuss the “peril of idolatry?” No. But in her homily on the subject of “good works.” It was in this direction that she expected the advance of the serpent, and, therefore, here she commenced by laying the foundation of faith fixed and immovable, by impressing on her people that the great source of truth was the written Word of God, and that that never had been departed from, whether under the law or under the Gospel, without producing, under the colour of “good works,” the most flagrant idolatry. Then taking up the three great divisions under which Rome had classed works of perfection—“vows of obedience,” “chastity,” and “poverty,” she shows that under the pretence of these, having let go the simple principle of justification by faith alone, there grew up the

aggregate of those destructive heresies under which Christendom so long groaned.

Not merely, however, is it *unfaithful* to rest an opposition to Popish institutions upon the extreme evils of the Popish system, but it is highly *dangerous* too. I certainly must say that I tremble when I see well-meaning men drawing up an indictment against the Church of Rome, founded upon documents supposed to inculcate that church, and calling upon our parliament, constituted as it is at present, to deal with the opposing churches according to the verdict which would issue from the investigation of those documents. Rome has such an "enormous lying" power at command, such an unscrupulous disposition to evade a charge, at whatever sacrifice of honesty and truth, and there is such an excessive indisposition on the part of men in general, and especially those indifferent to religious truth, to draw a conclusion that would involve penal results—or that would even seem unkind in its bearing, where the benefit of a doubt might be given to the accused party, that even if I saw the proof to be strong and decisive, I should hesitate very long indeed before I rested on such a result, perhaps the very existence of our church establishment. And if in the view of Romish evasiveness this would be the case when the proofs against Rome were strong and decisive, how much more must it be so when the proofs are really of such a kind that no intelligent jury on their oaths would be likely to come to any other conclusion than that a verdict of acquittal should be recorded in favour of the parties charged! Of this, however, more hereafter.

From the spirit of St. Paul's Epistle, then, not more than from the distinct evidences of identity between the Church of Rome and the great foretold Apostasy, which they contain, I gather that the Church of Rome must be the predicted falling away.

I shall merely glance at the vast confirmation which this view of the matter derives from the Book of Revelation, and the other portions of Scriptures which are emphatically of the prophetic character. Hence we learn that the Apostasy should be a revival of Paganism; (Rev. xiii.) that bondage and persecution should be its marked characteristics; verse 10;) that it should constrain to union with it all Christendom; (v. 16.) that its great constraining power should be the excommunicatory principle; (v. 17.) that it should constantly be protested against by a faithful view (xi. 3, 10) who should at length attain a great ascendancy; (verses 11, 12; xiv. 1—12, and elsewhere;) that worldly riches, pomp, and glory, should be possessed by the fallen church, (xvii. 4, 5, and xviii.) and that the seat of apostasy should be Rome. (xvii. 18.) In a word, there is not one single mark that is branded on the Apostasy which the Church of Rome does not possess, nor one single feature of heterodoxy for which that church is notorious which is not given as a characteristic of the great moral monster against which mankind is warned by the Word of God.

In order that every one of my readers may see at a glance the chief

marks of the Apostasy, and satisfy himself as to their applicability to the Church of Rome, I shall here give a brief enumeration of them; not designing more than that that enumeration should lead the reader to search the Scripture for himself, in order that he may find whether these things are so. The enumeration that I give will lead me to reiterate a great deal of what I have already said; I trust, however, that the conveniency of this brief mode of laying down the subject will be thought to excuse the repetition.

The following, then, are the marks to which I allude:—

1st. "Celibacy." "Some shall apostatise from the faith, forbidding to marry" (1 Tim. iv. 3.) The scorn with which Roman Catholics regard a married priesthood, can only be realized by those who live in a Roman Catholic country. Though the Popish church calls matrimony "a sacrament," its members habitually blaspheme the ordinance.

2nd. "Vows of poverty." "Commanding to abstain from meats" (iv. 3.) As before stated, the word "meats" in this place stands for the necessities of life in general; still the passage may refer to those distinctions of diet which, under the Popish system, are demanded by a "holy life."

3rd. "Saint-worship." "Giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of demons," or "doctrines concerning demons," or the spirits of dead men. This has its exact counterpart in the "invocation of saints."

4th. "Lying legends." "Speaking lies in hypocrisy;" that is to say, "profane and old wives' fables." The life of "St. Philomene," already given, is an admirable illustration of this and the preceding point, though it by no means stands alone in extravagance and profanity.

5th. "Universal prevalence." "All that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the Book of Life,"—"both small and great, rich and poor, free and bound." (Rev. xii. 8, 16.) Why should not the gates of hell be wide, the road that leadeth to destruction broad?

6th. "Persecution." "The woman was drunk with the blood of the saints, and of the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." (Rev. xvii. 6. See also xi. 7.) How monstrous to call the burning of believers an *auto da fe*, i. e. "an act of faith!" To burn such men as Ridley, Latimer, Cranmer, Bradford, Taylor, and Hooper, constituted very extraordinary "acts of faith." The conclusion of the writ for the "act of faith" on Cranmer ran thus: "We order, that the said Thomas Cranmer, now being in your custody, in a public and open place within the liberty of our city of Oxford, for the cause aforesaid, in the presence of the people, be committed to the fire, and you shall make the same Thomas Cranmer to be really burnt in the same fire, (*ipsum Thomam Cranmer, in eodem igne realiter comburi faciatis*.) in detestation of his crime, and as a manifest example to other Christians. And this bill, signed with the

hand of us the said Queen, shall be your sufficient warrant and discharge for the same."

7th. "Exclusive dealing." The apostate church was to bring it about that "no man should buy or sell, save he that had the mark of the beast, or the number of his name." (Rev. xiii. 17.) This is the power that hunts to starvation every man in Ireland who dares to think for himself.

8th. "The number 666." (Rev. xiii. 18.) The word, *Αποστατης*, "apostate," in Greek makes 666. The word *Lateinos*, the Latin or Roman, (in Greek,) also gives 666, thus:—

Α L = 30	Α Α = 1
α α = 1	π p = 80
τ t = 300	ο ο = 70
ε e = 5	ς st = 6
ι i = 10	α α = 1
ν n = 50	τ t = 300
ο ο = 70	η e = 8
ς s = 200	ς s = 200
<hr/> 666	<hr/> 666

9th. The Apostasy was to be remarkable as being a "revival of Paganism." In the twelfth chapter of Revelation, Paganism, which is identified with Satan himself, and presented under the image of "a great red dragon, with seven heads and ten horns," is described as "cast out." (ver. 9.) But in the thirteenth chapter we find it revived again, and giving "its power, and seat, (Rome,) and great authority," to a monstrous beast resembling itself; and it is remarkable, that Pastorini, in page 109 of his work, ("The History of the Church." *Dub.* 1790,) states that "the Roman idolatrous empire will rise up again under Antichrist; because Satan will revive idolatry under the wicked man, who will become master of the ancient Roman dominions."

10th. "Blasphemy and spiritual pride." The beast was "full of names of blasphemy." Massillon thus speaks of the Romish priesthood. Can blasphemy exceed his language? And, yet, it indicates the habitual tone of such theologians as he:—

"It is a mediation between heaven and earth, which gives us authority over Jesus Christ himself [!] which renders him obedient, even to the mystic death of the holy mysteries [!] which places us, if I dare to say it, in the place of the Heavenly Father [!!!] and makes us beget his Son upon the altars, and in the hidden splendour of the sanctuary [!!!!] in a word, which establishes us, the visible God of the earth." [!!!!!!]

11th. "The degradation of its votaries." The 109th Psalm gives a frightful picture of misery. "His children fatherless;" "his wife a widow;" "vagabonds;" "beggars;" "victims of the extortioner;" "the spoil of the stranger;" and why all this calamity? Because "he

loved cursing, and delighted not in blessing." Who did? I answer, "Judas." Then it is his children who are thus accursed (compare ver. 8 of the Psalm, with "Acts" i. 20). But the name of Judas is, "the Son of Perdition," (see John xvii. 12,) who (2 Thess. ii. 3,) presides over the apostate church, the head of which, therefore, is the spiritual Judas; and it is his spiritual children, *i.e.* the spiritual children of the Pope, who are in the psalm pointed out as the victims of the misery therein denounced. And that misery is but an abridgement of the curses against apostasy, contained in Deuteronomy xxvii. and xxviii. chapters, and Leviticus xxvi. All of which would seem to be designed for a portraiture of the wretchedness and degradation of Ireland, and of Italy, and of other Popish countries.

12th. "Mock miracles, or real delusions of the wicked one." "He doeth great wonders, and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth, by those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast." (Rev. xiii. 13, 14.) It is here distinctly intimated, that the miracles alluded to would not stand the test of examination, that they could not live in an atmosphere of truth. Such tales as that of Philomene are very unlikely to be popular, (save as food for laughter,) in other than Popish countries.

13th. "Privacy of entrance, and identification in nature, with the apostasy of ancient Israel." "There shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, as there were false prophets among the people." (2 Peter ii. 1.) Hence, a ready answer to those Roman Catholics who ask, "When did our church apostatise?" We can reply, "Its apostasy was gradual, it came in 'privily:' and as the false prophets of the Old Testament professed to worship Jehovah, so that their apostasy was virtual, or at least not total and professed, so is it with Popery."

14th. "Mystery"—prayers in an unknown tongue; strange crossings, and bowings, and genuflexions; in fact, the Priestcraft of Popery (see Miss Dowling's advertisement in the last chapter), precisely meets that mark of the Apostasy denominated "mystery."

15th. "Great antiquity and long duration." "The mystery of iniquity doth already work," said St. Paul in his day, (2 Thess. ii. 7,) nor was it to be destroyed but "by the brightness of the coming of Christ." (Ver. 8.)

16th. The Apostasy was consumable by the Word of God. The hatred of Popery to the Bible, and the Bible burnings in this country, show the horror with which Popish priests regard the written Word.

17th. "Forbidding the rites of sepulture to those who have not the mark of the beast." They "shall not suffer their dead bodies to be put into graves." (Rev. xi. 9.) The bones of Wickliffe were exhumed and burned; every Irish clergyman who has been charged with the burial of converts from Popery, will testify to the power of that spirit of enmity here foreshowed. Young, in his "Night Thoughts," detailing the treatment which the body of a deceased relative of his (Narcissa)

received at Nice, in Italy, where the rites of burial were denied to her remains; thus feelingly, though perhaps unintentionally, illustrates the texts:—

For, oh! the cursed ungodliness of zeal!
While sinful flesh relented, spirit nursed
In blind infallibility's embrace,
The sainted spirit petrified the breast,
Denied the charity of dust to spread
O'er dust! a charity their dogs enjoy.
What could I do? what succour? what resource?
With pious sacrilege a grave I stole;
With impious piety that grave I wrong'd;
Short in my duty, coward in my grief!
More like her murderer than friend, I crept
With soft suspended step, and muffled deep
In midnight darkness, whispered my last sigh,
I whisper'd what should echo through their realms:
Nor writ her name, whose tomb should pierce the skies!
Presumptuous fears, how durst I dread his foes,
While nature's loudest dictates I obey'd?
Pardon necessity, blest shade! Of grief
And indignation, rival bursts I poured.
Half execration, mingled with my prayer;
Kindled at man, while I, his God adored,
Sore grudged the savage land her sacred dust;
Stamp'd the cursed soil; and with humanity
(Denied Narcissa) wish'd them all a grave.

Those Bulls of the Pope, which place nations under an interdict, constantly denied burial to the dead.

18th. "A virtual denial of Christ, and of his coming in the flesh," (See 1 John xi. 22; 2 John 7.) The glory of his advent in the flesh is made null and void, when a fictitious advent in the wafer is received, and held and taught as the great mean of salvation; as John Bradford, the martyr, well observed.

19th. "Earthly magnificence." "The woman was arrayed with purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones, and pearls." (Rev. xvii.) Those who have been at Rome, or read descriptions of its gorgeous ceremonials, will at once see the unquestionable propriety of this application of the text.

20th. "Babylon is its name." The tower of Babel is its type. "Let us build us a city and tower, whose top may reach to heaven." (Gen. xi. 4.) "Let us construct a human way to attain to eternal glory," is the language of modern "Babylonians." The true church is typified by Jacob's ladder, which was Christ, (see John, i. 51,) who declared of himself that he (and he alone) was "the way." (John xiv. 6.) Babylon burnt the witnesses of God, (Daniel iii,) and so did Rome. Babylon bore sway over all the earth, and so would Rome. The first king of Babylon,—the type of the rest—Nimrod, was a mighty man-hunter, (Gen. x. 9;) and so is the Pope! Babylon brought the ancient church into captivity, and so does Rome the church of Christ.

21st. It was to make merchandise of the souls of men. (Rev. xviii. 13, 2 Peter ii. 3.) At Rome everything is venal—sacraments, pardons, indulgences, deliverance from a fabled purgatory, the bodies of pretended saints and their relics; in one word, every single doctrine, principle, and fiction is an article of spiritual traffic. He who can bid high is assured of heaven, and need have no fear of hell, if he believe the priests.

22nd. The Apostasy was to be a thing prodigious—a marvel—a wonder—a stupendous power upon the earth; overthrowing, crushing, wounding, bruising, burning, and destroying the saints of God. It is predicted under the imagery of frightful monsters with seven "heads," "ten horns," and "iron teeth." Is it any wonder, then, that the belowings of Popery should threaten the integrity of the British empire, and seem likely to disturb the peace of Europe?

23rd. "Transubstantiation." In the apostasy of ancient Israel, Jeroboam set up two calves of gold, and said, "These be thy gods which brought thee out of the land of Egypt." (I Kings xiii. 28.) That is, he made images of the sacrifices which constituted the atonement of the people, and called these types of the atonement "gods;" and these gods the "false prophets" ministered to. But the "false teachers" under the Apostasy are identified in character with those false prophets; and the doctors of the Church of Rome—her teachers, exhibit the sacrament which represents the body of Christ, and proclaim before it, "This is your God, who delivers you from the bondage of sin and Satan."

24th. "Purgatory." This mark is given in Isaiah xxviii. 15, 16. Apostate Israel, with the principles of which, as has just been shown, the antichristian Apostasy is identified, is there said to have made "a covenant with death, and an agreement with hell." (See the passage.) Surely here we have the doctrine of Purgatory. That doctrine teaches "a covenant with death, and an agreement with hell;" but the imaginary defence is "a refuge of lies;" the "hiding place" is "one of falsehood," which will disappoint and not protect.

25th. The Apostasy was to be testified against by "two witnesses." (Rev. xi. 3). Few as the witnesses were to be in point of number, they should be adequate to justify the condemnation of the apostate church.

26th. The witnesses should at length attain to great pre-eminence, and triumph gloriously, to the grief and discomfiture of their enemies. (Rev. xi. 11, 12, 14.) Their triumph serving to characterise, mark, and distinguish at once themselves and the Apostasy to which they were opposed.

27th. Simultaneously with the completion of the Apostasy—when "the transgressors should be come to the full" there should rise up an "exceeding great" power, which should prevail over the east, and trample upon the church there. (Daniel viii. 9—13.)

28th. The Apostasy was to be remarkable for a separation from it of every faithful soul, and for a downward progress towards perdition; a

growth in foulness and corruption, until at last it should become utterly hideous. (Rev. xviii. 4, &c.)

29th. The Apostasy was to grow great by the power of kings, (Rev. xiii. 1,) and to be impoverished by the power of the people. (Rev. xvii. 8, 16.)

30th. The seat or see of the Apostasy is Rome. "The woman which thou sawest is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth." (Rev. xvii. 18.) The Douay Bible, commenting on this passage, says, "If this verse means any city, it means Pagan Rome." Certainly Pagan Rome, for Papal Rome is a revival of the other.

I think we may say, with the puritan divine, Baxter, in the contemplation of such an array of particulars, that "if the Pope be not Antichrist, it is his misfortune to be so like him."

CHAPTER X

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED—OBJECTIONS—DR. TODD AND HIS SCHOOL.

The view of the divine government of the world brought before us in the Scripture is exceedingly grand. We are enabled with the Bible in our hands to survey the history of mankind since the planting of the Christian church, and to see that all the great changes which have affected the families of the earth—those vast moral revolutions which have carried kingdoms along in their gigantic sweep, before which the dynasties of the earth have been driven like the sand, have all been matter of distinct prediction. It is impossible, in the review, not to experience a sense of profound awe. There is realized to the soul a solemn conviction that none but God could have thus seen the end from the beginning; and the heart thrills at the consideration that we should really, verily, and indeed, and beyond any manner of question, hold in our hands a revelation from that Almighty Being—a revelation of his will and of his purpose with respect to us, his wishes, his designs, his promises, nay more, actual representations of a surpassing state of happiness which he has prepared for those who will accept it on the terms in which he has proposed it.

Let me give a brief sketch of that which is brought before us in the foreshowed history of the world. And, here, perhaps, it were well that I should state that, in order to prevent embarrassing the subject by considerations not so immediately interesting to modern times, I omit the development which the same Scripture would enable me to make of the course of events which preceded the Christian era.

We learn, then, that the church, as it existed in the times of the apostles, was distinguished for zeal, energy, and purity. We are

informed that this was to continue to be the case for some time ; that it was to go on conquering and to conquer, and extensively to bless mankind with light, and knowledge, and peace ; that it was to produce a casting of the idols to the moles and to the bats ; the downfall, in a word, of these idolatries which were equally offensive to God and pernicious to men.

We learn that the progress of the true religion would excite the rage of the professors of the false, and animate them with the murderous spirit of the first-born, Cain ; that the rulers of the earth would be stirred up to eradicate the faith by the wholesale destruction of the faithful, but that so far from persecution injuring, it would purify and refine the church, keeping it clear of false professors, and compelling the afflicted followers of their crucified Master to seek for strength and peace in that communion with him through the Spirit, which could alone be enjoyed through faith ; that the blood of the martyrs would become the seed of the church, and that their faithful and devoted testimony, even unto the death, would operate with so much power, that at length the whole system of Paganism would be overthrown, and the inhabitants of the world become the avowed followers of Jesus Christ.

We learn that Satan, frustrated in his purpose of destroying Christianity by fire and sword, should adopt a new system of attack ; that those whom he could not subdue by force, he would endeavour to corrupt by falsehood and seduce by flatteries ; that he would succeed in this flagitious design ; that he would gradually induce indifference to God's written Word, which he would supplant by lying traditions ; that instead of the pure devotedness which grew out of a love of truth, and whose moving power was an all-embracing charity, there should grow up a zeal without knowledge ; a self-denial, whose real end was the gratification of carnal pride, and that instead of the liberty which had God for its Author, and the humility which bowed before him and before those to whom he awarded honour, there should be the bondage of legality, and a meanness which prostrated before the creature the lively image of the Creator.

We learn that there would thence follow an era in which spiritual death should career with triumph through Christendom ; that darkness should prevail ; woe and misery be all but universal. In effect, we gather that the whole church should become doctrinally corrupted—corrupted, moreover, with that exact leaven of the Pharisees and leaven of Herod, against both of which Christ so solemnly warned his disciples ; that is to say, with that admixture of formalism in practice which is sure to grow out of a belief in the justifying merit of human works, according to the doctrine of St. Paul, as developed in the last chapter ; and with that admixture of worldly influence which so naturally flows from state alliance with the church, when that alliance is not sanctified by the simultaneous prevalence of the purest principles, and by a careful exclusion of an interested usurpation by the state of the indefeasible prerogatives of the church.

We learn that the progress and working of all this moral evil should at last result in a complete nullification of the life-giving properties of the faith, and that the consummation of the Apostasy should be the elevation of a great spiritual tyrant as the visible God of the earth. The soundest Protestant commentators date the complete development of the foretold Apostasy from the year 606, in which Boniface III. was proclaimed "universal bishop" by the usurping Emperor, Phocas.

We learn that when the church should become thus corrupt, when, as the result, idolatry should abound through all its quarters, east, west, north, and south, that God would in judgment allow the rising up of an "exceeding great" infidel power, which should overrun the east and the south, taking possession of the promised land. This power proved to be Mahomet. His energy, though it involved enmity to the revealed will of God, was evidently animated by an abhorrence of idolatry, of the rabble of "saints" and of their images, with which the decay of pure principles had deluged the Christian world. In opposition to all this, the rallying cry of his hosts was, "There is but one God, and Mahomet is his prophet!"

Such was the disastrous issue of the growth of corruption in the church.

What a glorious evidence of apostolic zeal did the eastern world present! The apostle Paul wrote the majority of his Epistles to eastern Christians. The Corinthians, the Ephesians, the Philippians, the Colossians, the Thessalonians—these were all either Asiatic, or situated on the borders of Asia. The Epistle of St. Peter shows us that believers were plentifully scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia. St. John addressed seven flourishing churches in Asia, but the infidel apostasy of Mahomet was allowed in judgment to prostrate all these churches; Christians were regarded as but "dogs" in the estimate of the followers of the false prophet. The faithlessness which originated their corruption was thus punished by the desolation that succeeded it.

Prophecy directs the eye of the believer as it were from an eminence to this deplorable condition of the eastern and the western world. It commands us to look to the east, and to contemplate fields of carnage, lust, and brutality, fearfully predominant throughout the realms of the infidel apostate. It commands us to look to the west, and to behold nations degraded by an effeminating superstition, the bond-slaves of countless task-masters. It then presents unto us the encounter of these opposite divisions, of the earth, and it makes our ears to ring with the groans of humanity, bleeding and dying through the consequences of that moral darkness in which a disregard of the lively oracles of heaven had involved the world. There is not one striking phase in the history of the dark ages that the pen of inspiration has not pictured for us. But, amid all, there was a power at work. What was that power? It was mightier than the hosts of

Mahomet; it was more potent than the cross-bearing knights of the Crusades; it was an oracle—it was a text: it was the Word of Him who was “the Truth,” it was “The gates of hell shall not prevail against it.”

We learn that, fearful as might be the prevalence of apostasy on every side, God would not leave himself without “witnesses;” that from the very outset of corruption he should have a faithful few to testify that salvation was by grace through faith, and that not of ourselves, but the gift of God. (Eph. ii. 8.) That these witnesses should be small in number, but sufficient for the condemnation of those who rejected against themselves the truth of God; that they would be reviled, scorned, persecuted, put to death, and, when slain, denied Christain burial; but that their word should be fraught with tremendous energy, enlightening, enlivening, and purifying the church, confounding and overwhelming their enemies.

We learn that these witnesses should, in fact, revive primitive truth, and draw out from the midst of corrupt Christendom a pure body, vast in number, glorious in holiness, conspicuous in position, preaching to the world the everlasting gospel, denouncing ruin upon Babylon, the fallen church; which, after the withdrawal of the faithful from it, should become gradually more and more drunk with the infatuation of error; more and more besotted in the stupefactions of apostasy, more and more locked up in the bouds of prevalent corruption, until at length it should become a habitation of devils, a hold of every foul spirit, a cage of every unclean and hateful bird.

We learn that while the apostate church should grow in rage and enmity against that reformed body which had restored primitive truth, there should be a growth of infidelity through the nations, arising in a great measure from the debasement of doctrine and the divisions existing in the nominally Christian world, and that at length the apostate church should place itself at the head of the powers of the earth; should guide, govern, and control them; should marshal them into hostile array against Christ, and against his people; and when their united rage and blasphemous fury were at their height, the brightness of the coming of the Lord should defeat the terrific conspiracy, annihilate the diabolical hosts of confederates, destroy the great Babylon as a millstone in the sea, and establish the earth in a condition of felicity beyond example and without degree.

The above is but a weak attempt at comprising, in a brief and compendious form, the substance of those scriptural predictions which respect the history of the church. I am far from pretending that I have supplied my readers in this work with adequate evidence that such are the great outlines of the picture which the pencil of inspiration has developed and filled up. That must be reserved for another work.

I have been forced to the conclusion, that in order to be effective on

the Irish mind, Irish works are necessary. Though the works of English divines may have their effect upon the more learned and thinking part of society in this country, the great mass are prone to attend more readily to something which originates among themselves, than to that which, at least on such a subject as the one in question, requires to be imported from the sister country. It is only from this trait of nationality, if I may call it so, that I can explain the influence exerted upon the Irish mind by some exceedingly erroneous and mistaken writers—men whose opinions are at once dangerous and heterodox, at variance with the mind of the Spirit, whether expressed in the Scripture or by the church, who yet are in some degree popular as expositors of prophecy. Were it not for the prevalence of this feeling, I should suppose that I had done enough if I had directed my readers to study Mede, Faber, Scott, Newton, Bickersteth, Croly, and other sound commentators on the prophets. As it is, I feel it incumbent on me to attempt to set forth in a distinct work, not my own private opinions or fancies on the subject, but those correct views which may be pronounced Catholic, and which have been adopted by the greatest of our divines.

However, from what I have said, it will be admitted that, if prophecy do, indeed, convey to us those truths which I have stated, it supplies us with the means of meeting in a manner the most triumphant the advocates of Popery. I am rather under the apprehension that I may have been supposed by different passages in the course of this work to have deprecated the attacks that have been made upon the grosser characteristics of the Popish system—upon certain details of its abominations, such as its murderous, persecuting, and rebellious principles, as though there were no ground for charging the Church of Rome with atrocities so great as those details involve; or as though it were preferable, instead of charging home these atrocities upon her, to dwell upon other features of hideousness by which she is deformed, rather than on these. I trust that I may be acquitted of a petulance so great as such a state of mind would involve. I am convinced that the spirit of Popery is bloody, base, and treacherous; but I am at the same time equally convinced, that in order that this may be made conspicuous, palpable, plain, and effectual, all its objectionable peculiarities must be brought forward as part and parcel of an illustration of the Word of God. We must make God himself the Author of the indictment, and we must prefer it in his own way; we must not merely not supersede the views which he has brought before us, but we must exalt and glorify them. That would be strong and unanswerable, brought forward as an illustration of the Scriptures, which would identify Rome with the Apostasy, which, if laid to her charge in the abstract, if made use of merely to prove that she is a false, a corrupt, or a dangerous society, might be evaded, and thus prove not only unsuccessful, but dangerous. Scripture itself has showed us the mode in which we should employ everything which is really to the detriment of Rome; and if, instead of adopting the plan which God has laid down for our

guidance, we prefer a mode of our own independent of it, as we may be justly charged with presumption, so may we be brought to taste the bitter fruits that would grow therefrom. Prove Popery to be the Apostasy, which may be so very easily done, and the whole system will appear an abomination. Thus, we at once destroy the idea of the "infallibility of the Church of Rome," negative the pretensions of the Pope to supremacy, prove the unsoundness of all his peculiar doctrines, and bring forward every matter of detail that is open to objection with a strong likelihood not merely of its probable but certain application to the evil which we set forth. Keach, in his treatise on Antichrist, published 1689, has marked a difference between the early and later defenders of the Reformation. He begins his treatise in words so exactly explicative of the principle which I am here contending for, that I think it important to quote them:—

It is evident to all men who are of any reading, that most of our eminent Protestant ministers, both ancient and modern, do affirm without the least doubt, that the Church of Rome is the great whore spoken of, (Rev. xviii.,) called Mystery, Babylon; yet we find that most worthy men, who have of latter times so well defended the Gospel, have not so much bent their study this way as to detect divers or most of her erroneous principles and detestable practices; which is rather to lop off some of the branches of this evil and cursed tree than to dig it up by the root; for if it be clearly proved that she is the Great Whore, viz., Mystery, Babylon the Great, Mother of Harlots, the whole falls at once.

I trust that these observations, if an explanation were necessary, will justify the course that I have adopted, and show that it is from no spirit of self-glorification, but from a deep consciousness that it is vastly important to meet Rome in a manner that is quite unassailable, that I have insisted upon the importance of opinions, the peculiar excellence of which I am far from pretending to claim as my own.

Having as above laid down, as it were in a panoramic view, the vast picture which Scripture presents us with, I shall proceed, on the other hand, to set forth the manner in which the Church of Rome and her advocates deal with the prophetic Scriptures.

They pretend, then, that all, or the chief prophecies about the Apostasy are still unfulfilled; and they base this hypothesis upon rather a curious circumstance.

The duration of the Apostasy is in the Scriptures declared to be "1260 days." This extraordinary period just makes, according to the old computation, "three years and a half," or "forty-two months;" (for the year of the ancients coincided in number with the degrees of a great circle, namely, 360;) and it has been the uniform practice of all the commentators in the reformed church to interpret these 1260 days, as "prophetic days," each day signifying a year, according to the language of the prophet Ezekiel, "I have appointed thee each day for a year;" (Ezekiel iv. 6;) or, as the Hebrew has it, (see the marginal note,) "a day for a year." (See also, in further illustration of the matter, the 4th and 5th verses.)

Taking advantage of the prophetic notation, the Papists have insisted that the days mentioned are not *prophetical* days, but *literal* days, and accordingly they have argued that the duration of the Apostasy and the reign of Antichrist were to be only for the three years and a half immediately preceding the coming of Christ! Thus, they have concluded that the prophecies of Daniel, which foretel a great Antichrist, with the majestic though terrible imagery which he employs, together with the prophecies of St. Paul and St. Peter, and the still more elaborate visions of the Book of Revelations, refer in the main to the transactions of the last three years and a half of the present dispensation.

I will not take the trouble of exploding, by anything in the shape of laboured argument, this erroneous hypothesis. The thing seems so extremely absurd, that it scarce needs refutation. The very first verse of the Apocalypse is, "The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him to show unto his servants things which *must shortly come to pass*." (Rev. i. 1.) And the same idea is expressed in the third verse, "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein: *for the time is at hand*." (ver. 3.) And the very language employed in these two verses of the first chapter is repeated in the 6th and 10th verses of the last chapter of the book. In the face of such statements, to lay it down that the prophecies thus set forth would all remain unaccomplished till the day of judgment, and the previous three years and a half would appear to be as likely a way of bringing the book into utter neglect as could be well thought of. Under such a supposition, wherefore the extraordinary exhortation to the study of the book with which it commences? In fact, there is a peculiar blessing promised to the study of it, as the third verse of the first chapter, given above, distinctly shows.

But perhaps it may be said by Papists and others, that the texts which I have quoted, prove too much for my purpose; for that, if taken strictly, they may not merely mean that some of the events predicted were "at hand," but that they all were; whereas it is quite evident that this cannot be the sense implied, inasmuch as the day of judgment, which is revealed and described in the book, is still future. Well, then, take another text: "Write the things which thou hast seen, and the things which are, and the things which shall be *hereafter*." (Rev. i. 19.) Now, I would ask, when we find such a prophet as the apostle St. John commanded to write the things which are, and which shall be hereafter, is it possible to avoid the conclusion that that which was revealed to him—that which he "wrote," was, in fact, the whole of that which was to take place after his time—in a word, the history of the church? Had the intention of the book been that which the Papists would have us to believe it was, we can scarcely suppose but that the command conveyed to him would have been, "Write the things which are, (referring to the seven churches of Asia,) and the things which shall be at the coming of the Son of man, and

at the end of the world." (See Matt. xxiv. 3.) The justice of this view of the case seems confirmed a little further on; for, after the apostle had had the revelation made to him, which peculiarly concerned his own times,—namely, respecting the welfare and condition of the seven churches—"the things which are,"—we find it written, "After this I looked, and behold a door was opened in heaven; and the first voice which I heard was as it were of a trumpet talking with me, which said, Come up hither, and I will show thee things which must be hereafter." Surely it is impossible to read such passages, to recollect that the apostle was writing in the infancy of the church, and that a concern for its welfare, and for the glory of its Master, was the feeling which, above all others, engrossed his mind, and with respect to which he desired information, without being forced to the conclusion, that that which he was commissioned to write was just the church's history. But, in truth, the whole tenor of the book indicates that such was its object. That Babylon, which is the main enemy fore-shown, is declared to be "The mother of harlots and abominations of the earth." Would it not be extraordinary to say, that there have been no idolatrous churches, no ecclesiastical abominations in existence from the apostolic age until the present time? Surely it would; and if religious abominations of all sorts have existed from a remote antiquity, that Babylon that was their parent must have had an existence prior still. To allege, therefore, that Babylon represents a power that should rise up in the last three years and a half, and be destroyed at the day of judgment, is utterly to falsify the inscription which the apostle shows to have been written on her brow. Moreover, how could it be truly said of a power so brief and transitory, as it is said in the 18th chapter, and 24th verse, that "in her was found the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth." However, I shall not dwell longer upon the subject. In the Protestant hypothesis—that in the apocalyptic visions taken in connexion with the predictions of St. Paul, St. Peter, the prophets, and those of the Lord Jesus Christ himself, we have a history of the church unto the end of time—there is so much of reasonableness, that the mind rests upon it with perfect satisfaction; whereas the Popish hypothesis produces a feeling which is just the very reverse.

Nevertheless, this Popish hypothesis has, in these Tractarian times, found advocates. I understand that the leader of these has been our townsman, Mr. William Burgh—save the mark! An individual for whose mental qualities and religious views I have always had so thorough a contempt, that I never read more than a few pages of his writings. These I found to be at once so dull and so unsound, that I turned from them in disgust; and know no more about the views of the writer, than that which I have collected from notices of them in other works.*

* Mr. William Burgh, previously to the discussion with Father Maguire, placed himself in a position of hostility to the author. The issue and all the circumstances will be found in the correspondence prefixed to the church edition of "The Report of the Discussion."

Another great supporter of the Popish hypothesis—not that I mean to say that Mr. Burgh is a “great supporter” of anything—is the Rev. Roffey Maitland, librarian to the Archbishop of Canterbury; and a pity it is that the primate of England should have about him so heterodox a gentleman. Neither have I read Mr. Maitland’s writings; I have seen them quoted at considerable length in various works, and from specimens that I have met with, I cannot hesitate to pronounce him a brilliant writer and an able man. That he is dangerously erroneous in his views, the sequel will abundantly show.

However, the chief of this class may be pronounced to be Dr. Todd, Fellow of the University of Dublin. He has published, in maintenance of his opinions, a very elaborate work, entitled “Discourses on the Prophecies relating to Antichrist, in the writings of Daniel and St. Paul, preached before the University of Dublin, at the Donnellan Lecture, MDCCCXXXVIII.” In these discourses he argues all through to prove that the prophecies referring to Antichrist and the Apostasy, are not at all applicable to the Church of Rome, but that they refer, as the Papists allege, to an antichristian power, which is to prevail for three years and a half before the coming of Jesus Christ. I have read this work through, attentively, two or three times. It is dedicated to Mr. Maitland, and highly complimentary to Mr. Burgh, but it is as unsound as superficial, and as flippant as any theological treatise that I have ever met with. It makes a vast display of learning—Syriac, Chaldee, and Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and French, &c.—Jerome, Ignatius, Irenæus, and the rest of them meet the eye in every page. All this is calculated to dazzle the eye of under-graduates, and flatter the vanity of the author. To one, however, who is really acquainted with the subject, this misapplied learning goes for nothing at all, if it do not rather excite loathing and disgust. That Dr. Todd is passably made up in the languages we may be sure. He teaches them in a seminary, second, in point of reputation, perhaps to none in Europe or the world. The publication of a thick volume was not necessary to convince his cotemporaries of Dr. Todd’s scholastic pretensions. If it were, that which now lies before me would suffice. Should the reader search in it, however, for the qualities of a divine, for sobriety of judgment, discrimination of view, vitality of faith, zeal for God and for his truth, realization of the nature, character, and perilous consequences of error, and decision against it, his search will be in vain, and he will close the book under a conviction that it is a mere emanation from that spirit of heresy which, at the present day, is the canker and the plague of the church. There is not one single syllable in Dr. Todd’s volume that marks him as aught else than a mere letter theologian. He has been called “a learned divine.” No, no. He is a learned scribe, or a learned linguist, or a learned student of the Fathers; but in the best sense of the epithet he is no divine at all. John Bunyan, the tinker of Bedford, was a divine. He had the spirit of his Master, and he showed it. From the teaching of the Spirit of God he derived wisdom, and judgment, and truth. He

was mighty in the Scriptures, though he knew nothing of the Fathers. But it is impossible to trace in Dr. Todd's volume the slightest evidence of spirituality of mind. The dry bones in Ezekiel's vision were not more lifeless than our author.

The learned doctor might perform his functions very well if the college authorities constrained him to teach orthodox divinity, and to withhold his own views until they coincided with those of the church; he might then be a very useful man; but, at least at the time he wrote his volume, he was utterly incompetent to originate correct views on the subject which he undertook to treat of; and it was cruel in the extreme to those young people whom he lectured, to allow him to drag them at his tail in the footsteps of such leaders as Messrs. William Burgh and Roffey Maitland.

* I should be excessively sorry to be "a hewer of wood and drawer of water;" and the task of wading through Dr. Todd's fallacies would be scarcely less irksome than that of a labourer so hapless. His book is a mere book of cavils; it could only be exceeded in tediousness by one which should answer it; and assuredly of all the tedious books in the world, that which would answer a book of cavils, cavil by cavil, is the most tedious. I certainly would undertake nothing of the sort. I trust that I may, some day, be allowed to develop the whole subject of the anti-papal predictions of Scripture. Such a work, if adequately done, would not merely answer the college lecturer, but other blunderers on the same subject. The present, however, is not the occasion for undertaking it; and I shall now deal with our Doctor in another fashion.

I presume that Dr. Todd's views of prophecy satisfy his own private judgment.

I am certain that my views on the subject satisfy my private judgment.

Dr. Todd is convinced that the Apostasy foretold is not Popery.

I am convinced that it is.

I am to suppose that strict reasoning, as he thinks, has led the doctor to *his* conclusions.

I know that the strictest reasoning has led to *mine*.

Now, in order to decide between us, the question is, What is the mind of the Church upon the subject? I undertake to show that it is clearly and distinctly expressed in my favour—that Dr. Todd, in delivering his lectures and in publishing his volume, knowingly and willingly set at nought the distinct voice of the church—of the reformed church—of the holy Catholic Church—of the church of which he is a minister, and of the greatest names that adorn it. I am sure that his doing this indicates the genuine schismatical spirit. I know this from my own heart. I trust that I never write anything, that I never in public say anything, involving essential principle, of which I am not deeply and heartily, by the application of my own reasoning powers laboriously exercised upon the Word of God, convinced. When convictions such as these accord with the church's teaching, and energise

the mind in such a way, that they become moving principles—principles of action, I think I am warranted to draw the conclusion, that they are of the operation of the Spirit of God. But if my reason were ever so much convinced that the Scripture conveyed a sense against which I found that the current of feeling was strong in the church, against which the wisest divines and the best men spoke, and wrote, and laboured, and in opposition to which the express teaching of the church herself might be adduced, I should shudder at the idea of standing up by the advocacy of these, on my private judgment, to excite division amongst the people of God. I confess I should distrust my conclusions, I should hesitate as to the worth of a wisdom which condemned the greatest, the holiest, the most devoted, and the most learned of my fathers and brethren in Christ; and if I do not quite mistake, this is the genuine Catholic spirit—the spirit of unity, peace, and power.

Need I then say, that the greatest and most popular of living divines view Popery as the predicted Apostasy, and the Pope as Antichrist? that this is the view which is popular among Protestants? For myself I recollect that one of the first impressions on my mind when a child, was, that the Pope was Antichrist; the how, the why, or the wherefore, I could not tell; but this was the sentiment which prevailed throughout that Protestant society that I was familiar with. The statement was, in fact, a proverb, a kind of household symbol. But it was in the writings of the great and learned Joseph Mede, who was a fellow of the University of Cambridge in the sixteenth century—truly a learned divine, the cotemporary and the friend of Archbishop Ussher—that I first saw the Protestant principle clearly developed and proved. He may be pronounced the great leader in the work of sound prophetic interpretation. He would appear to have been raised up by Providence to give order and arrangement to the prevalent views of the reformed church; and from him the wisest of our commentators, as well as the most learned, have largely drawn. One of the most distinguished modern writers on the subject, is the Rev. George Stanley Faber, whose works are exceedingly popular.

With one voice the reformers gave their testimony that the Pope was Antichrist, and “the Man of Sin.” This doctrine was powerfully instrumental in bringing about and establishing the Reformation. It was the main reason given for separation from the Church of Rome, which was thus warranted on the express direction of God himself. (Rev. xviii. 4.) In the Homilies of the church, which are sanctioned by the thirty-nine articles, the following testimonies respecting the Pope as Antichrist and the Man of Sin, and the Church of Rome as Babylon appear:—

In the Homily of Obedience, (Part III.,)

“The Bishop of Rome teaches that they that are under him are free from all burdens and charges of the commonwealth and obedience towards their prince; most clearly against Christ’s doctrine and St. Peter’s. *He ought, therefore, rather to be called Antichrist, and the successor of the Scribes and Pharisees, than Christ’s*

vicar, or St. Peter's successor; *seeing that*, not only on this point, but also in other weighty matters of Christian religion, in matters of remission and forgiveness of sins, and of salvation, *he teacheth so directly against both St. Peter and against our Saviour Christ.*

In the Homily against Peril of Idolatry, (Part III.,) speaking of the worship of images and the miracles of the Papists, the Homily says:

The scriptures have, for a warning hereof, showed, that *the kingdom of Antichrist* shall be mighty in miracles and wonders to the strong illusion of all the reprobates.

And again,

Such sumptuous decking of images with gold, silver, and precious stones, be a token of *Antichrist's* kingdom, who, as the prophet foreshows, shall worship God with such gorgeous things.

For she being, indeed, not only an harlot, (as the Scripture calleth her,) but also a foul, filthy, old, withered harlot, (for she is, indeed, of ancient years,) and understanding her lack of natural and true beauty, and great loathsomeness, which of herself she hath, doth, after the custom of such harlots, paint herself, and deck and tire herself with gold, pearl, stone, and all kind of precious jewels, that she, shining with the outward beauty and glory of them, may please the foolish fantasy of fond lovers, and so entice to spiritual fornication with her: who, if they saw her (I will not say naked,) but in simple apparel, would abhor her as the foulest and filthiest harlot that ever was seen; according as appeareth by the description of the garnishing of the great strumpet of all strumpets, the mother of whoredom, set forth by St. John in his Revelation, who by her glory provoked the princes of the earth to commit whoredom with her. (Apoc. xvii.) Whereas, on the contrary part, the true Church of God, as a chaste matron, espoused (as the Scripture teacheth) to one husband, our Saviour Jesus Christ, whom alone she is content only to please and serve, and looketh not to delight the eyes or fantasies of any other strange lovers or wooers, is content with her natural ornaments, not doubting by such sincere simplicity best to please him, who can well skill of the difference between a painted visage and a true natural beauty.

Sermon against Wilful Rebellion, (Part V.)

After this ambition, [to be head of all the church, and lord of all kingdoms,] the Bishop of Rome became at once *the spoiler and destroyer both of the church*, which is the kingdom of our Saviour Christ, and of the Christian empire, and all Christian kingdoms, as an universal tyrant over all.

In King John's time, the Bishop of Rome understanding the brute blindness, ignorance of God's Word, and superstition of Englishmen, and how much they were inclined to worship *the Babylonian beast of Rome*, and to fear all his threatenings and causeless cursing, he abused them thus, and by their rebellion brought this noble realm of England under his most cruel tyranny.

And as the church of England is express on this point, so also is the church of Ireland. Not merely does the Irish church authenticate and adopt those views thus set forth in the Homilies, but in her own peculiar articles, which were prepared by archbishop Ussher, she thus speaks:—

The bishop of Rome is so far from being the supreme head of the Universal Church of Christ, that his works and doctrines do plainly discover him to be that Man of Sin foretold in the Holy Scriptures, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and abolish with the brightness of his coming.

The church of Scotland is like-minded on the subject, as the following extract from the Westminster "Confession of Faith" will show:—

There is no other Head of the Church than the Lord Jesus Christ, nor can the

Pope of Rome be in any sense the head thereof ; but is that Antichrist, that Man of Sin, and Son of Perdition, that exalteth himself in the church against Christ and all that is called God.—Ch. xxv. s. 6.

That such should be the avowed principle of the reformed church will appear little wonderful, when the sentiments of the great men who reformed it are taken into consideration. I here give a number of extracts, very brief, indeed, in their extent, drawn out of the writings of these our martyred fathers in the faith. I may add that I have derived them, in the compendious form in which they are here laid down, from an admirable little work of the Rev. Edward Bickersteth, entitled “Remarks on the Progress of Popery,” and that it is to be understood, that the quotations are mere specimens, taken in most cases from elaborate disquisitions on the point in question.

CRANMER, in his book on the Sacrament—

After showing that Christ “made a sacrifice and oblation of his own body upon the cross, which was a full redemption and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world,”—he adds, “but the Romish Antichrist, to deface this great benefit of Christ, has taught that his sacrifice upon the cross is not sufficient hereunto, without another sacrifice devised by him, and made by the priest ; or else without indulgences, beads, pardons, pilgrimages, and such other pelfray, to supply Christ’s imperfection.”

“O heinous blasphemy and most detestable injury against Christ ! O wicked abomination in the temple of God ! O pride intolerable of Antichrist, and most manifest token of the Son of Perdition, extolling himself above God, and with Lucifer exalting his seat and power above the throne of God ! For he that taketh upon him to supply that thing which he pretended to be imperfect in Christ, must needs make himself above Christ, and so very Antichrist.”

CRANMER, at the stake—

As for the Pope, I refuse him as Christ’s enemy and the Antichrist, with all his false doctrines.

LATIMER, in prison before his martyrdom—

What fellowship hath Christ with Antichrist ? Therefore, it is not lawful to bear the Yoke with the Papists. Come forth from among them, and separate yourselves from them, saith the Lord.

RIDLEY, in his farewell letter, before he suffered—

The see of Rome is the seat of Satan, and the bishop of the same, that maintaineth the abominations thereof, is Antichrist himself indeed. And for the same causes, this see at this day, is the same which St. John calls, in his Revelation, Babylon, or the whore of Babylon, and spiritually, Sodom and Egypt, the mother of fornications and abominations upon earth.

Again, in his lamentation for the Change of Religion, he says—

What city is there in the whole world that, when John wrote, ruled over the kings of the earth ? or what city can be read of, in any time, that, of the city itself, challenged the empire over the kings of the earth, but only the city of Rome, and that since the usurpation of that see, has grown to her full strength ?

BRADFORD, in a letter to Lady Vane—

The usurped authority of the supremacy of the bishop of Rome, is undoubtedly that great Antichrist, of whom the apostles do so much admonish us.

In his Sermon on the Lord's Supper—

It is a plain sign of Antichrist to deny the substance of bread and wine to be in the Lord's Supper after consecration ; for in so doing, and in granting transubstantiation, the property of the human nature of Christ is denied : for it is not of the human nature, but of the divine nature, to be in many places at once. Now grant transubstantiation, and then Christ's natural body must needs be in many places, which is nothing else but to confound the two natures in Christ, or to deny Christ's human nature, which is the selfsame thing, St. John says, as to deny Christ to be come in the flesh.

JEWELL, on 2 Thess. ii. 4.—

Thus the apostle speaks of Antichrist, he is the Man of Sin and the Son of Perdition. He then, in a long series of particulars, applies the description given in this prediction to the Pope, dwelling especially on his pretences of belonging to Christ, and serving Christ.

HOOPER, in his Declaration of Christ—

The very properties of Antichrist, I mean of Christ's great and principal enemy, are so openly known to all men that are not blinded with the smoke of Rome, that they know him to be the beast that John describes in the Apocalypse, as well as the logicians know that "man is distinguished from other animals by the faculty of laughter."

Bishop Hooper has many cautions and solemn warnings against a peculiar temptation in Mary's reign, for those in principles Protestant to conform to Popery in practice, and attend the mass. He compares it to a wife's adultery. He says—

Beware of foolish and deceitful collusion, to think a man may serve God in spirit secretly to his conscience, although outwardly, with his body and bodily presence, he cleave, for civil order, to such rites and ceremonies as now be used contrary to God and his word. Be assured, that whatsoever he be that giveth this counsel, shall be before God able to do you no more profit than the fig-leaves did unto Adam.

Bishop Hooper also frequently gives the name of Antichrist to Popery, speaking of "the synagogue of Antichrist," "Antichrist's tyranny," and "Antichrist and his damnable religion," "the Pope the capital enemy of Christ and his religion."

FRITH annexed to a work called "The Revelation of Antichrist," an antithesis contrasting the acts of Christ and the Pope, in seventy-seven particulars.

TINDALE—

The Jews look for Christ, and he is come fifteen hundred years ago, and they not aware : we also have looked for Antichrist, and he has reigned as long, and we not aware : and that because either of us looked carnally for him, and not in the place where we ought to have sought. The Jews had found Christ verily, if they had sought him in the law and the prophets, whither Christ sendeth them to seek. (John v.) We also had spied out Antichrist long ago, if we had looked into the doctrine of Christ and his apostles, where, because the beast sees himself now to be sought for, he roars.

FULKE—

Paul, (2 Thess. ii.) speaking purposely of Antichrist, says expressly, that he shall sit in the temple of God, which is the church of Christ. Now the Pope sits in the midst of the temple of God, and boasts himself to be God, challenging unto himself such authority as is proper only unto God, and usurping such honour as is peculiar unto God. Therefore, not in heathen emperors, nor in Mahommedans, is the prophecy accomplished.

It will confirm the position which I have taken, that I should show that the same opinions were popular long before the Reformation.

THE WALDENSES (from the testimony of Reinerius Saccho, in 1254) asserted—

That the Romish church is not the church of Jesus Christ, but a church of malignant, and that it apostatised under Sylvester—and that the church of Rome is the harlot in the Apocalypse.

THE ALBIGENSES (from the testimony of Book of Sentences, or Register of the Proceedings of the Inquisition from 1307 to 1323, from the sentence of Peter Auterius, an eminent Albigensian,—

The Roman church you impudently call the mother of fornication, the church of the devil, the synagogue of Satan, which is, in fact, the mother and mistress of all the faithful; all whose degrees and orders, and its laws and statutes, you malign by your impertinent falsehoods. And on the other hand, you call all those who hold its faith heretics and misled persons, and wickedly and impiously teach, that none can be saved in the faith of the Roman church.

The Reformers referred to the Fathers, as strengthening their testimony; thus—

MUSCULUS, referring to Bernard's calling a Pope the "Man of Sin," says—

No man can charge us that we be the first that have referred the same unto the head of the most corrupt clergy, I mean Simon of Rome.

MARTYR also states—

Pope Gregory says, whosoever will arrogate this title of universal bishop, or head of the church, to himself, is Antichrist. But the Pope challenges unto himself this title, wherefore the Papists must bear it with an indifferent mind if we call the Pope Antichrist.

I will add to the above some testimonies taken from the foreign Reformers.

LUTHER—

Whosoever is seriously affected with piety, will fly most swiftly from that Babylon, and will dread even hearing the name of the Papacy. For so great is its impiety and abomination, that no one can reckon it up in words, nor can it be seen but with spiritual eyes.

The vicar is in the place of an absent chief—what is such a vicar but Antichrist?

I know, and am certain, that the Papacy is the kingdom of Babylon.

ZUINGLIUS, on 2 Thess. ii., (answering the papal application of it to the Protestants) says—

“Let our doctrine be examined, and it will appear that they are false. We preach Jesus Christ and him crucified, and that he is the only reconciler and the only succour of man ; but the Papists preach the Pope, the Antichrist, whom here Paul so accurately describes.”

MELANCTHON—

Since it is most certain that the pontiffs and monks have forbidden marriage, it is most manifest, and without any doubt true, that the Roman pontiff, with his whole order and kingdom, is the very Antichrist.

CALVIN—

The Papists have imagined an Antichrist who would harass the church for three years and a half. But all the notes by which the Spirit of God designates Antichrist clearly appear in the Pope ; but that three years Antichrist keeps the foolish Papists engaged, lest seeing they should see.

ÆCOLAMPADIUS—

God is jealous, and suffers not that his servants should draw in the yoke with Antichrist. He has no part with Belial and with darkness. Now we learn, that through fear of persecution, you so dissemble your faith and conceal it, as to communicate with the unbelievers, and to partake in the abominations of the masses, in which you are aware that the death and passion of Christ are blasphemed.

I cannot doubt, but that my readers, in the view of these passages, will be at once able to decide as to the downright opposition that exists between Dr. Todd and the church, whether speaking through its authoritative formularies, or by the voice of its greatest divines. I beg that it may not be supposed that I have given anything like an array of the great names in the church, which may be exhibited as favourable to the Protestant view of prophecies. Perhaps I could scarcely adopt a clearer way of showing that this is the view which may be said to be universal amongst us, than by quoting the opinion of the Roman Catholic Dr. Milner, as expressed in his “End of Controversy.” He thus speaks in the chapter in which the doctrine is referred to.

One of Bishop Porteus's colleagues, Bishop Halifax, speaks of this doctrine concerning the Pope and Rome, as long being “the common symbol of Protestantism.” Certain it is, that the author of it, the outrageous Martin Luther, may be said to have established *Protestantism upon this principle*. [There can be no manner of doubt of this. In truth, were it not for the application of the prophecies concerning Antichrist to the Pope and Popery, the Reformation never would have maintained its ground. It would have been still-born, and yet Dr. Todd tells us that such an application of the prophecies is quite erroneous. That is, in fact, that the Reformation has been based upon a lie.] He had at first submitted his religious controversies to the decision of the Pope, protesting to him thus:—“Whether you give life or death, approve or prove, as you may judge best, I will hearken to your voice as to that of Christ himself ; but no sooner did Pope Leo condemn his doctrine, than he published his book “Against the execrable Bull of Antichrist,” as he qualified it. In like manner, Melancthon, Bullinger, and many others of Luther's followers, publicly maintained, “that the Pope is Antichrist,” as

did afterwards Calvin, Beza, and the writers of that party in general. This party considered this doctrine so essential, as to vote it *an Act of Faith*, in their Synod of Gap, held in 1603. The writers in defence of this impious tenet in our island, are as numerous as those of the whole continent put together, John Fox, Whitaker, Fulke, Willet, Sir Isaac Newton, Mede, Lowman, Towson, Bicheno, Kett, &c., with the Bishops Fowler, Warburton, Newton, Halifax, Hurd, Watson, and others too numerous to be here mentioned.

But in fact, the mere enumeration of the supporters of this doctrine would occupy pages—I shall therefore be content with those which I have already given, and reserve for the next chapter my proof, that Dr. Todd knowingly set himself in opposition to the voice, the feelings, and the principles of the church of which he is a member.

CHAPTER XI.

DR. TODD KNOWINGLY SET HIMSELF AGAINST THE VIEWS OF HIS CHURCH.

The question is, was Doctor Todd aware of the Catholic nature of this doctrine?—that it was the doctrine prevalent amongst the members of the reformed church—I may say the universal doctrine—the doctrine not only of the laity, but of our wisest and greatest divines?

The system of prophetic interpretation which may be called the Protestant one, contemplates, perhaps, the chief part of the prophetic writing of the Scriptures. It presents the prophets of the Old Testament, equally with those of the new, conspiring to foreshow those tremendous spiritual evils which, centering in the Papacy and deriving from it, have been, during a long course of centuries, if not the real source of the miseries of the world—for that source is, in fact, the fallen condition of mankind—at least the great obstacle to the removal of those miseries, to the healing of that breach which original sin has made. Doctor Todd knew all this, and he expended his labours in his “Discourses on the Prophecies,” not merely to exhibit his dissent from the views of his church and of his brethren, but to attribute to those views the prevalence in the church of an unchristian, an uncharitable, of a mean, a paltry, and a lying spirit. That I do not speak on this subject one whit more strongly than the facts warrant, let the following extracts from Dr. Todd’s book prove.

Before I give the extracts it may be well that I should state, that Dr. Todd derives the chief support in the way of authority which he offers for his opinions, from the writings of the early Christians, or the Fathers, as they are called. Now I, as an individual, humbly profess that I have a great reverence for Christian antiquity. I have always both felt that reverence and confessed it; and I have not merely read,

but translated and published what may be called a summary of those views which the early Christians took of prophecy, involving though they did the misapprehension which Dr. Todd has promulgated, and to the correctness of which he has lent the sanction of the official character of a fellow and a lecturer of Trinity College, Dublin. I cannot think, however, that any one of sound judgment could ever read the Fathers, or any of them, in the expectation that he would find in them a correct interpretation of prophecy.

St. Peter, in the 1st Chapter of his Second Epistle, dwells with emphasis upon the certainty which the Gospel derived from the testimony of men who, like him, had seen with their own eyes the glory of the Lord manifested in the transfiguration on the mount. "We have not followed cunningly devised fables," says he, "when we made known unto you the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory. This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice, which came from Heaven, we heard when we were with him in the holy mount. We have, also, a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts." (2 Pet. i. 16, 19.) The "dark place" is futurity. The "day dawn," and the "day-star arising," are the nigh-drawing and appearance of the events foretold. And in accordance with the principle which these words imply, we find that the meaning of the prophetic scriptures has become clearer and clearer, through the progress of time. The church, by watching the events of history, and comparing these with the predictions of the inspired writers, has gradually perceived the development of the divine purposes, and read in these events the fulfilment of the Word of God. Surely, then, it were wise, in the interpretation of prophecy, to give more earnest heed to the voice of the reformed church—the church in the latter times restored to primitive purity and quickened by the Holy Spirit, than to go back to the testimony of men, who, however excellent their purposes, were situated in the "dark place," and were removed to such a distance from the event that it was impossible for them to perceive its "dawning." So far, however, from being governed by this wisdom, Dr. Todd has quite neglected it. He looks in the Fathers for that which he could not find there, and he sets at nought those interpretations of the modern church which come to us recommended by the guidance at once of the Spirit and the Providence of God. Let it not be supposed, however, that the doctor cleaves undeviatingly to the ancients; by no means; that which he cleaves to is the Popish hypothesis, and he rejects the ancients with as little scruple as he does the moderns, when their interpretations run counter to the views of which he has constituted himself the champion. But let us hear himself.

In his first lecture we read:—

"The new exposition [he means the Protestant exposition, that the

Apostasy was embodied in the Roman church,] originated with various sects, [primitive Protestants, in fact,] who, on different grounds were at that time engaged in actual warfare with the see of Rome; and how little ought to be attributed to the judgment of such expositors on a question where there was so much of passion and interest to mislead them, will appear, &c." ["Passion," and "interest," and such base considerations, therefore, were the animating motives of the early opponents of Rome! Much obliged to you, Doctor Todd.] (Page 27.)

"The modern doctrine became *popular* at the period of the Reformation." (Page 27.)

"Opinions asserting the Roman Church to be either in itself or in its visible head the fulfilment of those prophecies, which by the ancients were referred to Antichrist and the latter times, were *popular* with three different, and, in their origin and doctrine, independent families of reputed heretics in the ages preceding the Reformation." (Page 28.)

And mark the motive to which our doctor traces those applications of prophecy.

"The exposition of the prophecies was made a tool of human passions, and desecrated to the unhallowed purposes of controversial warfare. [Doctor Todd, Father Maguire ought to pray for you!] Ignorance and fanaticism were driven, in the rage of party spirit, to seek in the prophecies a justification of their own opinions, or a refutation of the system of their opponents." [That is to say, it was the "spirit of party rage" which produced the Reformation, and which has disgraced with the very "ignorant" and "fanatical" expositions here denounced, the authoritative doctrines of our own church in the Homilies, and elsewhere; otherwise our church is of the devil!—so teaches Dr. Todd.] (Page 35.)

The denunciation of the Papal authority as antichristian became, in the twelfth century, he tell us, "from various causes, peculiarly *popular*." (Page 44.)

"The doctrine was closely interwoven in its origin with party spirit, and with the blinding rage of angry controversy or ruthless persecution." (Page 46.)

"The arguments that are employed to support this exposition, [that of Mede and the Protestants,] although they have received the sanction of *high and venerable names*, appear to rest on a very weak foundation." (Page 48.)

"Many of the ancient Christian writers apply the prophecy to the Roman empire." [But because this application would lend support to the Protestant view, Dr. Todd denounces it, although recommended by the authority of "*many* ancient Christian writers."] (Page 49.)

"St. Irenæus (A.D. 120) speaks of the fourth kingdom as identical with the Roman empire." [But because this ancient saint would thus lend some weight to the Protestant opinion, Dr. Todd spits in his face!] (Page 50.)

"St. Jerome appears to have been among the first propounders of this opinion; *Regnum autem quartum quod perspicuus pertinet ad Romanos ferrum est, &c.* (i. e. the fourth kingdom of iron clearly pertaining to the Romans.) [But because this would favour the Protestant view, Dr. Todd plucks Jerome by the beard!] (Page 50.)

Sulpicius Severus, who was of the same opinion, he equally sets at naught.

Further on, he canvasses "the sufficiency of the *common exposition*." (Page 52.)

He says, "Having done this, we are prepared to consider the evidence adduced in favour of the *common opinion*, that this kingdom is no other than the Roman empire." [And having considered the "common opinion"—the universal Protestant opinion—the voice of the reformed church—he modestly sets himself, (Dr. James Henthorn Todd,) Mr. Roffey Maitland, and Mr. William Burgh, by the repudiation of the "common opinion," against that "common opinion," against the opinion of the Luthers, the Melancthons, the Cranmers, the Latimers, the Riddleys, and the Bradfords—the men who have revolutionised the world, and bequeathed to us the inheritance of a free Bible and a free constitution.] (Page 67.)

He speaks "of the prejudices, or erroneous principles of interpretation that have led so many learned men to adopt an explanation of these prophecies irreconcilable with the sacred text." [And to lay down their lives in defence of it, he might have added. But, I had forgotten, they were moved merely by the blinding of "party rage!"] (Page 82.)

In the third lecture he says, "The chief cause of this mistake was the assumption, *common to all the popular systems* of interpretation, *ancient as well as modern*, that the Roman empire is to be identified with the fourth kingdom of the prophecy." [Will any one then be so "blinded by party rage" as not to believe Doctor James Todd against the world!] (Page 89.)

He says, "I shall make some general remarks on the most striking defects and inconsistencies of the *common systems* of interpretation." [Those, namely, which arise from "the blinding rage of angry controversial discussion," a rage which thus appears to be the prevalent characteristic of our church. A pretty church indeed! call such a church! rather a synagogue of Satan! How Doctor Todd, who views it as he does, can condescend to eat its bread, puzzles me; did I hold of it as Doctor Todd does, I should most assuredly regard myself as more justifiable in being connected with a den of thieves than with it. Little do I wonder, when I consider such commentaries as those of Doctor Todd, at the prevalence of those apostasies in Oxford which astound the age. I will not call the doctor a Jesuit, but this I am convinced of, that nothing which the Jesuits could have done could be half so prejudicial to the church's interest, and to the cause of Christ, as the spread of such a work as Doctor Todd's Discourses, if it did spread.] (Page 102.)

Again—"We are now prepared to examine the principles upon which the modern *popular* expositions of these prophecies have been framed, and [to do what? To glorify God for the wisdom that he has conferred upon our divines, who framed them? To rejoice in the consideration that there was no mistake in the origin of that movement from Rome, which was consummated by the Reformation; no spirit of lying error, lurking in "modern popular expositions." No! but] to point out their unsoundness [!], as well as the difficulty of reconciling them with the sacred text." [!!!] (Page 122.)

He proceeds—"In the first place, we may remark that the *great majority* of modern commentators agree, &c. But as we have already seen, there exists no reason whatsoever, &c.," [that is, for supposing "the great majority of modern commentators" right.] (Page 123.)

Again—"Another leading error in the *common* principles or canons of interpretation, &c.," [so that our "common principles of interpretation" are all wrong! What an admirable "pillar and ground of truth," according to Doctor Todd, our church constitutes!] (Page 124.)

Again—"The *general* adoption of this erroneous canon of interpretation, &c.," [we gather from St. Paul, that the office of a bishop is to check the spread of erroneous interpretations, or rather to eradicate them altogether. When we find, however, Doctor Todd declaring that such interpretations are those which are "general," "common," "popular," promulgated by "the great majority of commentators," is it possible to avoid being forced by him to the conclusion, that our views about episcopacy are all wrong? Well might the bishops, in reading Doctor Todd's Discourses, cry, "Save us from our friends!"] (Page 125.)

Again—"And further I am disposed to believe, that the interpretation *generally given* is unsound and untenable." (Page 127.)

Again—"The *common interpretation*, I may add, appears to fail, &c." (Page 127.)

In the fourth lecture we read—"I conceive, therefore, that the licence which is *so commonly assumed* by commentators, [he means Protestant commentators on prophecy especially], is here utterly unjustifiable." (Page 162.)

There is no difficulty, however, according to Doctor Todd, in ascertaining the *Ignis Fatuus* which had led our divines astray, and originated in effect the Reformation, it was "the blinding rage of angry controversy." Sure I am that the headlong passions of Henry VIII., to which Papists attribute the British Reformation, were a thousand times a more creditable source for it, than the vile spirit whence, according to Doctor Todd, it emanated. That Providence should control to his own purposes, the violence of a reigning prince, is natural enough, and reflects no dishonour upon the Reformation which it gave occasion to and promoted; but it is hard to avoid a feeling of intense disgust in tracing the change, with our "learned divine," to the party rancour of the theologians who took a lead in it. But let us hear himself:—

"If it be the case that the prophecies have been employed as weapons of theological warfare, and that opposing sects have laboured to fasten on their adversaries the awful name and character of Antichrist; if, *for this purpose*, lax principles of interpretation have been adopted, and the sacred words of Holy Writ explained away, or compelled to yield to preconceived hypotheses, then, assuredly, the inconsistencies and contradictions which are to be found in the *popular interpretations* of these prophecies, are only the natural results of an error common to all such opposing systems." [And by your leave, good doctor, the Protestant Reformation is their result too!] (Page 187.)

The fifth lecture is on the prophecy of the Man of Sin, contained in 2d Thessalonians ii.; speaking of the Man of Sin, the doctor says—"These words are interpreted by a *very large majority* of modern commentators, to signify an ecclesiastical potentate." [The Pope, in fact. And the doctor then quotes Bishop Newton and Bishop Jewell, showing with what power and decisiveness they set forth the Protestant view, and continues.] "But every candid reader must see the great violence that is done to the prophecy by this interpretation." [Or, in other words, "every candid reader" must see what fools and heretics, "blinded by the rage of angry controversy," Bishop Jewel, Bishop Newton, and our greatest divines, the martyrs and the reformers, were, when compared with Mr. William Burgh, Mr. Roffey Maitland, and Mr. James Henthorn Todd, Doctor of Divinity!]

As a specimen of the weakness, the absurdity, the schoolboyism, into which a Doctor of Divinity and a Donnellan lecturer may sometimes be betrayed, I cannot avoid the temptation of extracting in full the following comment, which is given in the shape of a note, upon the Protestant interpretation of 2d Thessalonians ii. 4, viz.: "So that he as God, sitteth in the Temple of God, showing himself that he is God"—"he," *i. e.*, the Pope, sitteth in the "Temple of God," *i. e.*, in the church, "showing himself that he is God," *i. e.*, the vicar of Jesus Christ—"the visible God of the earth," as he has sometimes been called by his followers. But hearken to the Doctor.

"The figurative interpretation of this passage, adopted by many Protestant writers, has been framed to accord with the popular doctrine, that the Pope is Antichrist, and Popery the Apostasy; yet it may I think be shown that it is utterly inconsistent with that doctrine; for if we set out with the assumption that the Pope bears rule in the figurative Temple of God, it will follow, since the Pope bears rule only in the churches which have submitted to the Tridentine dogmas, and not in the Greek, Anglican, or Protestant churches; that, therefore, the churches infected with Popish errors, are called by the Apostle, 'the Temple of God,' and consequently cannot be apostate.

"Or, if we set out with assuming that these churches are the Apostasy, then the Pope, who bears rule only in them, and not at all in the churches, which have disallowed his supremacy, sitteth not in the Temple of God, but in a temple of apostates, and consequently cannot be the Man of Sin.

"Such are the inconsistencies to which we are liable, when we suffer our passions and the heat of controversy, to carry us away from the letter of the Word of God."

Now, gentle reader, I ask you, did you ever, in the whole course of your long and respectable life, hear such incomparable nonsense as this of Doctor Todd? According to our doctor, it is quite impossible that there can be such a thing as an apostate church; for if it be "apostate" it cannot be a "church," and if it be a "church" it cannot be "apostate!" or, even an heretical Doctor of Divinity; for if heretical, he cannot be a Doctor of Divinity; and if a Doctor of Divinity, he cannot be heretical!! or a schismatical Donnellan Lecturer; for if a schismatic, he cannot be a Donnellan Lecturer; or if a Donnellan Lecturer, he cannot be a schismatic!!! In fact, the dilemma of the doctor lends a far greater amount of stability to the Church of Rome than even the celebrated text; "On this rock I will build my church, &c.;" nay, it goes further, for it prohibits change of any sort, in anything. A blind painter, or a deaf musician, cannot have existence. For the painter cannot be blind, nor the blind man a painter, &c. It even goes further still; not merely does it forbid change of character, but inconsistency also. There cannot be, for instance, a runaway soldier; for "a soldier" cannot be a "runaway," or a "runaway" a "soldier!" or an ignorant lawyer; for if a lawyer, a man cannot be ignorant; or, if ignorant, a lawyer. As an antagonist to all such transmutations, or inconsistencies, the Donnellan Lecturer wields his immense dilemmatical horns, with which he warrants the stability of churches, the wisdom of Doctors of Divinity, the learning and the worth of all sorts of professors; he fastens each in his place, between the powerful and capacious prongs of his newly-invented theological fork. Well may so great a reasoner, and so wise a man, lecture us, poor ignoramuses, upon our polemical propensities, and present himself as the very model of cool, rational, and syllogistic defenders of the church!

How comes it that Dr. Todd did not see that his logical puzzle was just as applicable to his own interpretation, as to that on which he professedly animadverted? He tells us that "the Man of Sin" is to sit in the literal temple at Jerusalem; but does he not perceive that the moment "the Man of Sin" has possession of the temple, it is no longer the Temple of God, but a habitation of devils, so to speak; and that if this be denied, and the sacred place be pronounced still "the Temple of God," then may those possessing it claim the character of its meet occupants. So that the Antichrist of Dr. Todd might argue precisely as he (Dr. Todd) does, thus—"Setting out with the supposition that we possess the Temple of God, exalting it and reverencing it as we do, surely we cannot be pronounced 'apostate;' or, setting out with the other supposition, that those in the midst of whom I rule, are apostates, can I, then, sitting in a temple held by these, instead of in the 'Temple of God,' be pronounced, with anything like probability, 'the Man of Sin?'"

Thus might Dr. Todd's Antichrist plead Dr. Todd's authority, to prove either that his antichristian followers were good Christians, or he himself no Man of Sin! Nay, further, on our doctor's principle, the fulfilment of the prophecy of any given Antichrist might be pronounced an utter impossibility!!

In opposition to the scholastic jargon of the Doctor, however, the plain dictate of Scriptural sense is this, when Antichrist held the temple of God, though desecrated, it might still be recognised as the temple; and though recognised as the temple, it would not invest with the attributes of holiness, Antichristian possessors. And this view of the case applies equally well to the church, if considered as an apostolic community, or corporation. The apostolic community of Rome was originally a holy church; so, originally, were apostolic communities in general. According to the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, the Roman community at last became apostate and subdued the rest, so that he who sat at the head of it occupied (*exceptis excipiendis*) the ecclesiastical throne of Christendom. He sat supreme within the aggregate apostolical communities of the earth, (*e. e.*) and thus within that which, uncorrupted, would have been the holy Catholic church, or "the temple of God." And in this view of the case the Scripture has its complete accomplishment, notwithstanding the absurdities so logically "chopped" by Dr. Todd.

Let us, however, pass on.

Mark how he presumes, in the spirit of self-sufficient calumny, to charge home upon those who take up against Popery the language of the church, and that of the greatest names that adorn it, the vilest spirit of rancour and profanity. These are his words: "Let us not presume to desecrate these awful predictions to any polemical or party purpose." (p. 332.)

Would, sir, that you had had a little of the charity of the Christian, or the wisdom of the scholar, to withhold you from the presumption—the flagrant presumption of affecting to fathom the motives of the best part of the church, and, in the spirit of scholastic arrogance, of condemning them upon the simple warrant of your own heterodox prejudices!

In the sixth lecture, Dr. Todd takes as his text, 1 Tim. iv., about "forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats;" and he laboriously urges that this passage has no reference at all to Popery; while he admits, however, in the very second page of the lecture, that this application of it to Popery is amongst the "common systems of interpretation." (p. 276.)

Further on he says, "*The great majority of Protestant commentators, however, and many also in our own church, [being also "Protestant," by your leave, Dr. Todd,] have contended for a different interpretation of this and the parallel prophecies. They maintain that the Apostasy predicted by the apostle, is clearly identical with the great corruption of Christianity, which has prevailed and still prevails in the western*

churches. . . . , . . . That the communion of the Church of Rome is, therefore, the departure from the faith which is here intended, and the asurped authority of the bishop of Rome, the predicted Antichrist." (p. 316.)

He recognises the interpretation which is prevalent in the reformed church, for the sole purpose of denying its rectitude!

And he concludes his work by charging home upon those Protestant views which he repudiates, an origin truly diabolical. For the doctrine of Huss, Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, and the foreign reformers; of Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, Bradford, Taylor, Hooper, Jewel, Ussher, Sir Isaac Newton, Bishop Newton, Joseph Mede, Scott, and our greatest divines living and dead, our martyrs and confessors, and our church itself, and all the foreign Protestant churches, he can find no more suitable language of description than this—that it is "falsehood and exaggeration;" that it merely indicates the "arts of controversy;" (p. 349) that it involves "the spirit of bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking, with all malice;" that it is opposed to the "forgiving spirit" of the Christian religion; that "it aims at exaggerating the errors of the fallen church;" that "it casts aside the plain meaning of those prophecies;" that it "engages divines in vain and chimerical speculation;" that it is in "close alliance with human passions and polemical rancour." (p. 350.) Speaking of those interpretations and their source, he says—"The pride of controversy, the arrogance of scholastic victory, are but sorry guides to the mind of him who seeks to penetrate those mysteries," &c. (p. 351.) He informs us that the Protestant interpretation "has reduced the prophecies to obscure enigmas," &c. &c. (p. 352.) All this *brotherly* feeling is expressed in the concluding pages of Dr. Todd's work. Had I gleaned, as I might have done, from the body of it, it would be seen to have run into a "rancour" of polemical hostility against his church and her divines more sour and offensive still. However, I here cease to quote, for the present at least, from the work of the learned doctor, and shall proceed to dwell upon the conclusion which it confirms or forces upon the mind.

My readers will perceive that, of the prophetic Scriptures which predict an Antichrist and an Apostasy, there are two systems of interpretation. I shall refer to them in the order in which I have, in the preceding chapters, brought them forth:—

First. There is the Protestant system, which interprets those prophecies of Popery.

Secondly. There is the Popish system, which pronounces them still unfulfilled.

Much in the shape of reasoning can be advanced for each of these systems.

The "private judgment" of an individual may embrace either of them. But the judgment of the United Church of England and Ireland, is clearly expressed in favour of the former.

If there be any respect due to the judgment of our church, should

that judgment not overrule the private judgment of an individual, it should, at least, make him hesitate before he set up his own opinion against it. If he were not prepared to declare that the church was in error, and to engage himself in the work of reforming her, or else, declining this, to resolve on abandoning her, as so deeply imbued with corruption that reformation could not be looked for, and that union with her were improper, it would be his duty, as a considerate son, to suppress his singular opinions, rather than by promulgating them to distract his brethren in the church. If this be not the duty which churchmanship involves, I know not what is. If the right of private judgment amongst us be absolute, I know not how we differ from dissenters, nor what is to save us from schism. Far different, however, from that which such duty would mark out, has been the line of conduct adopted by Dr. Todd. In the indulgence of his own wilful spirit, his "right of private judgment," he has opposed himself and his school to his church and her most revered authorities, and that knowingly and willingly. Nay, he has opened upon them a battery of vituperation as loud, violent, and formidable as he had at his command.

It is quite impossible to adopt his views without admitting that the Reformation was based upon a gross error; nay, upon a "rancorous" lie. There can be no manner of doubt, but that, had Dr. Todd's opinions prevailed at the era of the Reformation, that reformation would not have taken place; and that if those opinions be sound at present, the Reformation was a most unjustifiable schism, and the reformed churches distinctly schismatical. If this be the case, the sooner the Reformation is renounced the better; and they alone are consistent who reconcile themselves, as Messrs. Newman, Ward, Oakley, and the rest of such seceders have done, to that church which, according to Dr. Todd, we have so long been uncharitably calumniating. I profess, for my part, that if I could follow Dr. Todd in his conclusions, I should follow Mr. Newman in his recantation. How exactly the latter gentleman agrees with Dr. Todd in his main argument, is evident in the following short sentence from his new work: "An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine." "Three years and a half are to complete the reign of Antichrist" (page 91). That Mr. Newman was not blind to the conclusion which follows from Dr. Todd's position, is evident from a previous passage: "Rome is either the pillar and the ground of truth, or she is Antichrist. In proportion, then, as they revolt from considering her the latter, are they compelled to receive her as the former" (page 73). This is as true as an oracle!

I beg that it may be kept in mind, that it has not been my intention to refute the doctrine of Dr. Todd, by a development of Scriptural principle, as opposed to that doctrine; my simple object has been to show, that, in advancing it, he has become the adversary of his church; and this, I think, I have very satisfactorily done.

It strikes me, as unquestionable, that our Lord and his apostles have strongly inculcated the duty of preserving the unity of the

church; and at pages 185—187 of this work, I have given an array of texts confirmatory of this principle. None but God can supersede his own command. It is not for us, if we can save our soul in the church, to abandon it because of corruptions which we may for ourselves avoid, and for the reformation of which we may labour within the apostolic body. The divine precepts exhort us not to separate, but to correct.

If separation be warranted upon the ground of corruptions which we disapprove of, there is an end of unity.

Those who separate on this ground, will be themselves separated from on the same; and the sensibility which led to the first division, will at length become so morbid, that there will at last be as many sects in the Christian world, as there are individuals capable of conceiving an occasion for offence.

The only separation that is lawful, is one, therefore, which God himself expressly commands.

Now, such is the nature of our separation from any manner of communion whatsoever with the Church of Rome.

The Holy Spirit has identified that church with the foretold Apostasy. He has designated it as Babylon; he has branded upon its forehead—"the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth;" and he cries to every one of her children, "Come out of her, my people!" Hence, secession from the Church of Rome is a *secession sui generis*. It has a divine warrant which cannot at all be pleaded for ordinary dissent; a warrant which lends to such dissent, no manner of countenance whatsoever.

But surrender this position, as Dr. Todd would have us do, let it appear that we have been auxiliary to the division of Christendom merely by reason of our discontent at Roman corruption, and we place ourselves under circumstances in which we shall not have the slightest reason for complaining of that sectarianism which affects ourselves.

It was in the assertion of these views that I met and drove from the field of argument Father Maguire.

For the conviction of the Church of Rome on the occasion referred to, I opened the main prophecies which predicted the Apostasy. Time was not afforded me during the nine days of the discussion, for developing as fully as I desired to have done the whole of the prophetic Scriptures upon the subject. Those, however, which I was enabled to apply were felt to be so satisfactory and irrefutable, that they left no doubt on the mind of the vast audience, while they utterly confounded my able and learned opponent. In his difficulty, he sheltered himself behind such heterodox divines as Dr. Todd. He quoted Hammond, Thorndyke, and a few others, who denied the applicability of the prophecies which I brought forward to the Roman Church. I, in reply, enforced the reasonableness of the view which I held; showed that in my interpretations I was supported by the voice

of the Holy Catholic Church, and that Hammond and the others were schismatical in setting up their private judgment against the express declarations of the body to which they belonged; and this it was which operated with power upon our Roman Catholic hearers.

They saw brought before them by the disputants two churches which claimed to be catholic; they had been drilled into a contempt for mere private judgment; they were forcibly impressed with the applicability of the marks of the foretold Apostasy to Rome; they felt that they did not bear the slightest application to the Church of Ireland; that reason, Scripture, and truth all leant in the other direction. When their champion, notwithstanding, quoted individuals of our body in his favour, I threw them overboard as heterodox, I fastened upon them the flaw of a licentious private judgment; and when I proclaimed that I spoke the voice of the Reformed Catholic Church in opposition to these individuals, I took along with me the sympathies even of the Roman Catholics themselves, whose habits of thinking led them lightly to estimate private opinion when it ran counter to ecclesiastical authority. Thus it was not only the rectitude of my views, but their catholic nature, which attached to them the powers of conviction with which they were accompanied. I should be the last to advance human authority against the plain dictates and the spirit of the Word of God. But when those dictates and that spirit are supported by ecclesiastical testimony, by the wisdom and the learning of the church, I cannot hesitate to think but that it is the will of God that such support should be made available to the refutation of error and to the persuasion of his children who may have been deluded by it; nor can I avoid believing, that had my arguments from Scripture been ever so strong, they would have told with but little power, had my learned opponent been able, justly, to stamp them as mere opinions of my own.

It was in three months after the discussion, that Dr. Todd began to deliver his Donnellan Lectures. Vast was the astonishment of the Protestant public when they became informed through the press, that the doctor was in the University pulpit denying the force of the arguments that had crushed Mr. Maguire, and asserting the erroneousness of those doctrines which had achieved so great a victory for the church. I confess that, knowing how the matter stood, and being perfectly aware that I had merely promulgated truths most firmly held, and generally too amongst us, I was in no small measure indignant at the intelligence; and I think it will not be denied that I was justified in concluding, that the copious denunciations of "polemical rancour," and such like, were intended for myself. For, although numerous writers, orthodox and able, were celebrated for the advocacy of the principles which I insisted on, I stood perhaps alone in making them just then the practical weapons of controversy. Though Dr. Todd's lectures drew down on me some sneers and laughter, the voice of the people at a great many public meetings was distinctly pronounced in my favour, and in opposition to Dr. Todd; and in one or two short publications

I vindicated the soundness of my sentiments. This I have now done at greater length. I promise myself to accomplish it more fully hereafter; and I feel convinced that the issue will be that, in the lapse of time, those catholic views which I have set forth will be universally prevalent; Dr. Todd's work be forgotten and uninfluential, and himself, with Messrs. Roffey Maitland and William Burgh, be merely referred to as partisans of a school at once unsound and dangerous. I have thought it well to put on record the rather distant relationship, perhaps, in which the publication of Dr. Todd stands to my labours. I felt not a little annoyed at the bruit which the Donnellan Lectures of October, 1838, produced; and, perhaps, this annoyance may have contributed something of irritability to the expression of my sentiments about the lecturer. Should this be the case, I regret it; at the same time I must say, that I think there may be just as great fault in an over degree of lenity towards such offenders as the one in question, as in the plainness of the reproof with which they may be visited. Christian charity is not that mawkish thing that keeps ever sounding forth the language of apology.

I hold that there is a very great analogy between the mode of ascertaining scientific and religious knowledge, and the criteria by which the soundness of each kind is tested.

There is a public judgment in the mathematical world, as is evidenced by the universal acceptance of such works as Euclid's Elements and the Multiplication Table. This public judgment does actually declare the mind of all the mathematical community, save such individuals of that community as may be meet for, or inmates of Bedlam. And to the public judgment every private judgment must conform, as by that public judgment it will be tried.

Yet, at the same time the right of private judgment in the scientific world is indefeasible, that right should be independently exercised, and imperatively insisted on.

That it should be constrained to arrive at the same conclusions which have been settled by the public judgment of the learned, by no means involves the idea that it is under constraint, or limited in respect of its liberty. And he would be but laughed at who would endeavour to produce heart-burnings amongst the schools, because the conclusions of the learned had been comprised within distinct sets of scientific *credos*.

And on the other hand, the man would be thought to have tolerably well disposed of a sciolist in geometry, who, without taking to pieces the details of such a person's arguments, had showed that they absolutely contradicted the conclusions of such a master as Euclid, or such a mathematical school as that of Trinity College, Dublin.

This is just the nature of the set down that I have in these "Thoughts" given to Dr. Todd. I have not showed the why and wherefore of his heterodoxy. I have merely showed that he is absolutely at variance with the religious Euclids, Eulers, and La Granges,

&c. ; and that in the immenseness of his own self-sufficiency he presumes to proclaim that the church herself is not only wrong in her conclusions, but has been led into error by hateful polemical rancour. How far the censure of such a gentleman should weigh in such a matter, the Christian world will decide.

Every one knows that Dr. Todd is learned in his way ; that he claims to be profoundly skilled in moods and tenses, and to know all about the expansion of x plus y , divided by q ; that he has wasted the midnight oil in ascertaining the differences which exist between the schools of the philosophers, and in finding out how boxing matches "came off" amongst the Greeks and Latins. No doubt he can prove to a nicety that the Shakspeares and Hemanases of the Greeks were much more concerned about knowing the number and the nature of the feet which entered into the metres of their odes than about the sentiment which they breathed ; and that it is a proper occupation for a wise man to spend hours in the consideration of a subject which gave those great masters and mistresses of song so much concern. Of course, Dr. Todd is learned ; every one knows that he has read all the tomes of the Fathers which he has quoted ; at the same time he is quite aware, that the staring, stupid world is disposed to give credit for a vast knowledge of patristic lore to every pretender who may choose to bedizen his pages with passages which he has quoted from the quoters of quoters, and from those who have quoted from them ; and that a man who presumes to allege that he gives the mind of Fathers whom he has only learned in quotations, if not a literary swindler, is certainly a literary humbug, (if those expressions be tolerable,) whose greatest dupe is—himself. Let Dr. Todd be "learned ;" but be it known to him, that it is wisdom to despise learning ; to hold it up to scorn and contempt when it runs counter to the simple dictates of the Word of God as learned with simplicity by the humblest artizan, who, while he attends to the voice of the church, on his knees obtains his doctrine from the teaching of the Spirit of God, and through that Word. Admirable, indeed, is properly applied learning. When such stores of erudition as Ussher, and Mede, and Luther laid up, are applied as they applied them, according to the analogy of faith, we may bless God for the labours of the scholar. But when literary finery is made use of to trick out doctrinal heresy, away with it ! The learning of the Methodist preacher who is mighty in the Scriptures, is a thousand times more valuable, aye, and profound too.

Take the case of a painter, learned in the nature of colouring, and able to pour you forth volumes of wise saws and modern instances on the subject of expression, perspective and proportion, all gleaned from the masters of art. He then sits down and embodies his theory in a sketch of the human figure, which, distorted throughout, indicates a total absence of taste, gifts, or power. Shall his theoretical knowledge reconcile us to his wretched attempt at artistic execution ? If so, we

may adopt Dr. Todd's theology, and as speedily as possible bow in submission to the Pope. The analogy holds good in every department of science and of art.

Except through those lectures of his, Dr. Todd is known to the general public in one way only.

In the year 1836 he indulged himself in a most extraordinary joke. He constructed a fictitious "Bull," or "Encyclical Letter," as if from Pope Gregory XVI., addressed to the Irish Roman Catholic prelates. This production was got up with so much of verisimilitude—being interlarded throughout with the *quasi* original Latin, and being conceived in terms which strikingly resembled those employed on such occasions by the see of Rome—that it might well pass for genuine. The publication commenced by saying, "The translator of the following curious document is unfortunately not at liberty to explain the manner in which it came into his hands. Were he able to do so, the doubts which may now, perhaps, be expressed as to its authenticity, could not have been raised; he must, therefore, trust to the sagacity of the reader, to discern in it those marks of genuineness which no fictitious document has ever been found to possess."

It is little wonder that such language as this should lead to the belief that the document was genuine, and that the frightful treachery, duplicity, and malevolence, which it brought home to the Pope, in what seemed to be his own Latin, were but the ordinary characteristics of the "sovereign Pontiff." Brought before the public eye, every one shuddered at the diabolic criminality of the conduct of the Popish priesthood in Ireland, when, lo and behold! forth comes our doctor to announce to the world, with the utmost gravity, that the startling production was merely a hoax of his, which he designed with a parabolical view, at once for the amazement, amusement, and edification of the public.

The result was a vast triumph to the Papists. Under the cover of this forgery they have retreated from the various charges since made against them. Through this one case, they excuse themselves from the necessity of defending any charge whatsoever; so that to the horse-play of Doctor Todd—if horse-play be the proper name for it—to his ponderous jocosity, there may be attributed no small amount of the detriment that has since arisen to the Protestant interest.

Whether the judgment of so excessively injudicious an individual should weigh against the universal voice of the Protestant church, which proclaims the Church of Rome the foretold Apostasy, is now left to the decision of my readers.

CHAPTER XII.

DR. O'SULLIVAN'S SYSTEM—THE EPOCH OF THE APOSTASY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

Since I commenced the remarks which have through some chapters occupied my pen, I have perused Dr. O'Sullivan's work, "Of the Apostasy Predicted by St. Paul." The eloquent writer is strongly opposed to Dr. Todd's views, and he wrote his book with the express purpose of refuting Dr. Todd, and of identifying the Church of Rome with the predicted Apostasy. Hence his *principle* is a sound one; Nevertheless, he takes a view of the subject which, if it may not be called singular, is certainly not that which prevails in the church. He labours, in a lengthened argument, to prove that the Church of Rome did not become apostate until she published the creed of Pope Pius IV. It will be seen, therefore, by my readers, that he thus agrees with the Rev. R. J. M'Ghee; and if what I have said with respect to the sentiments of that reverend gentleman, as to the creed of Pope Pius, in the chapter ii., Part II., have any force, it is to no small extent applicable to the hypothesis of Dr. O'Sullivan also. That hypothesis may be called a novelty. The ingenuity with which the author has worked it out, and the eloquence by which he recommends it, might tell very forcibly if the predictions of St. Paul stood alone; but connected as they are with those of the Apocalypse and of the prophet Daniel, the adoption of the hypothesis proposed would produce nothing but confusion.

Mr. Faber has elaborately demonstrated that the prophetical "three years and a half" assigned for the duration of the Apostasy, is but the latter half of a great period of "seven prophetical years" assigned in the counsels of God for the duration of Gentilism, under the sway of Babylon the great. He shows that this great period of seven prophetical years, divided into two equal periods of "three times and a half," the "former" and "the latter times," commenced with Nebuchadnezzar, and that from his time to the development of the Apostasy, under Boniface III., in 606, was just 1260 prophetical days, (*i. e.*), three and a half prophetical years, or "the former times." And that the fulness of the Antichristian Apostasy at this date was to be simultaneous with the rise of a vast spiritual despotism, which should pervade the eastern parts of the world. So the event turned out. Mahomedanism dates from the same time as the Papal Supremacy—the coincidence was foretold in the oracles of heaven. This may be pronounced the prevalent opinion in the Protestant Church, and with it Dr. O'Sullivan's hypothesis is altogether irreconcilable.

The witnesses against the Apostasy were to be few in number, poor, despised, and persecuted. (Rev. xi.) How little does such a description accord with the condition of Protestants since the Reformation! yet it exactly describes them during the ante-reformation ages. (Rev. xi.)

Dr. O'Sullivan's hypothesis, taken in connexion with the duration assigned to the Apostasy, would defer the destruction of the Apostasy very nearly a thousand years beyond the period at which Scripture and the church would teach us to look for it.

Beside, if the adoption of a new creed be so heinous a fault, what will excuse the adoption by the church of the Athanasian creed? Should the doctor reply to this, that the Athanasian merely develops the creed of Nice and that of the Apostles, the Roman Catholics will allege the same for that of Trent. If it be a mere development of orthodox formularies, Dr. O'Sullivan will not deny that it would be legitimate; if, therefore, he insists that its adoption renders the Church of Rome apostate, he begs the question of its (the creed's) heterodoxy.

The creed of Pope Pius IV. denotes an era very different from that of the apostasy of the Church of Rome. It marks the beginning of the last act of the tragedy, rather than the opening of the first. The Apostasy was to enter privily, to be developed mysteriously, and from the time of its fulness to be protested against steadily by suffering witnesses, who were to be persecuted and slain in obscurity and contempt, until the times of refreshing should come from the presence of the Lord. Then he should withdraw from the midst of the corruptions of Babylon, a pure and reformed church, within which, those who should bear testimony to his truth, instead of suffering in darkness, should triumph in light; and upon whose withdrawal from the midst of the apostate church, that church should proceed in a downward course, becoming constantly more deadly and more dangerous. The date of the creed of Pope Pius IV., November 1563, may be considered as fixing the moment of separation.

It seems to have been the counsel of God that, as it was under the Jewish dispensation, so, for a length of time, it should be under the Christian. The chosen seed were in the old dispensation holden in the midst of Babylon. Had one of the spiritual intelligences winged its way to earth, and asked, "Where is Israel—the heirs of the promise—the chosen of the Lord?" the finger of direction would have pointed to Babylon, and the answer would have been—"There! behold them flung to the lions—cast into the fires, but in every place maintaining the truth and glorifying its Author." So it was also during the "Babylonish captivity" (as Luther calls it) of the Christian era, when the Papal power, with scarcely let or hindrance, tyrannised over the living church. The refiner's fire had not yet separated "the precious from the vile." There was required testimony against Babylon, rather than withdrawal from its midst. The witnesses were rather to keep *themselves* pure, than to announce the deliverance of a *community* that was

so. The moment had not yet come. The church was then commissioned to cry, "Babylon is fallen, that great city!" (Rev. xix. 8—xviii. 1, 2.) Foul, however, as she was—base, vile, and abominable as she was, the command to leave her was not given, till "another voice from heaven" proclaimed, "Come out of her, my people." (Rev. xviii. 4.)

The adoption of the creed of Pope Pius marks, perhaps, *this* era. It signifies not the time when Rome became apostate, but when her apostasy was no longer tolerable. The heresies which that creed authenticated had prevailed in the Church of Rome long previously. They were manifested in her prayers, in her preachings, and in all her devotional exercises; but by their embodiment in the Tridentine Creed, they were rendered more definite and palpable. The stigma in the right hand became a brand burned on the brow; and the explicit confession of that which had been held for ages, at once justified the protest of ancient witnesses, and the separation that was thus at length rendered necessary.

For these and numerous other reasons which this is not the place for enumerating, I am reluctantly compelled to express my dissent from what may be called the O'Sullivan system. I must, *on the merits*, humbly give my verdict against it.

But on another ground it is useless. That which I am here discussing, is "the proper mode of maintaining the Roman Catholic controversy." He, then, that would stand with success against the Roman Catholic church, must be able to claim for his opinions, at least, the support of his own church; and he is but little acquainted with the current of Roman Catholic sentiment, who is not convinced that "private interpretation" will receive at the hands of Roman Catholics nothing but mockery and contempt. Their champions advance against us brandishing the Bulls of Rome. Let us meet them with the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God, and let them understand that in wielding it we have our feet placed upon the immovable "ground," and our back supported by the firm "pillar" of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.

When a singular opinion, like that of Dr. O'Sullivan, falls in with the tenor of the whole prophetic Scriptures—when, instead of being inconsistent with those views which have been held (if I may use the proverb) at all times, by all persons, and in every place, it assimilates with them, then, its singularity, far from enduing it with an air of heterodoxy, causes it to be at once regarded as a choice discovery, and adopted as a valuable item in the details of the general faith. Of such a character was Mr. Faber's admirable application of the 8th of Daniel to the rise and spread of Mahomedanism. Though this application was quite new, or very nearly so, (it had not at least been developed in this sense before Mr. Faber developed it,) and although it was therefore totally subversive of the application previously, almost universally, made of the prophecy in question to Popery, and might thus be said to have been contradicted or op-

posed by all previous commentators—certainly it was not supported by them; still, though it differed from the received interpretations, it was only as it were incidentally while it served to give to those interpretations, upon the whole, order and consistency. The previous application of the prophecy of the “King of fierce countenance” to the head of the church of Rome, rendered it a kind of useless appendage in the great machine of prophecy, which, under the then arrangement, though in many respects satisfactory in its operation, yet could not be said to work without an awkward hitch occasionally. Mr. Faber’s happy thought rendered the thing so far forth perfect. What had been a kind of superfluous appendage, was found to be a misplaced member. The novel application was recognised as exactly the thing needed. It rendered the general adjustment complete; and without dislocating anything that had been satisfactorily posited, led to the rectification of several minor discrepancies, and resulted in the production of one harmonious whole, so symmetrical and admirable that it left scarcely anything further in the way of improvement to be desired.

It is not, therefore, on the mere score of being novel and singular that the church will be sure to dissent from Dr. O’Sullivan’s hypothesis, but because that hypothesis is not only irreconcilable with the ascertainments of prophetic interpretation, but calculated to reduce the whole to a chaos—a jumble of heterogenous and preposterous predictions.

Before I quit the subject I would submit one additional thought to Dr. O’Sullivan. If additions to the Creed of Pope Pius IV. be so weighty an offence, what shall we say to those who denounce not only that creed, but the Apostles’ and the Athanasian Creed too, indeed, absolutely, and “at one fell swoop,” not only *all* the creeds, but every sort and description of authoritative statement of doctrine whatsoever, as for example, the Independents, and, I believe, other sects also do.

This much I am quite sure of, that a talented Roman Catholic advocate, such as unquestionably Father Maguire was, could avail himself of this view, as a set-off to Dr. O’Sullivan’s objection, in such a manner as would be pronounced triumphant.

“What sir! we are apostates? Are we? We, an ancient and venerable church! and why? Why, because we add explanatory clauses to the Nicene Creed! clauses rendered necessary by that identical heresy which you, sir, stand up to advocate. We do not reject the Nicene Creed—mind! we retain it; we make use of it constantly, much more frequently than we do of the Creed of Pope Pius, for it is repeated at the celebration of every mass—mark that, my friends! this identical creed from which we are said to have “departed”—to be apostate, forsooth,—is an essential part of our sacred liturgy; yet, still we are apostates for departing from it—for “departing from” the Nicene Creed, from which, as I have just proved to you, we have not departed at all; nay, we press it to our bosom, and

cherish it as a consecrated *depositum fidei*. We are apostates ; but the men who actually reject the Nicene Creed, aye, and the Apostles' Creed, and the Athanasian Creed to the back of it; the Independents, the Quakers, the Shakers, and ten thousand others; these, though they trample under foot all the holy creeds of nineteen centuries, these are not apostates, forsooth! Oh! no, not at all; they are 'beloved brethren in the Lord,'" &c. &c.

I venture to think that this sort of appeal would pass muster in a mixed multitude as quite conclusive, and that there is so much of *primâ facie* plausibility about it, that it would seem extremely imprudent to renounce a system which has all the force that belongs to that of Dr. O'Sullivan, without involving any inconvenience of the kind here animadverted on.

FREE THOUGHTS ON PROTESTANT MATTERS.

PART III.

CHAPTER I.

THE DUTY OF LABOURING FOR THE CONVERSION OF IRELAND.

Bear it in mind, gentle reader, that what I am driving at is this—in subordination of course to higher, holier, and more enduring considerations—I say what I am driving at is this, to render Ireland a country for Irishmen. To be sure we live and breathe here, as it is, and it is our duty to say, “God’s will be done,” with respect to whatever miseries he visits us with. Moreover, “this is not our rest, but we seek one to come.” Still after all, while I admit these truths, and am quite as alive to their importance as any of those who urge them as alone important, I consider that it is a Christian work that we should labour to render our country, Ireland, habitable by Irishmen.

“Righteousness exalteth a nation: and sin is a disgrace to any people.” Call it not resignation to sit down contented under the national “disgrace” that national “sin” imposes. Call not ungodly those politics that would seek to wipe off so huge a national calamity. I laugh to scorn, then, the imputation that I am influenced by sordid, worldly motives. I understand all that can be said, and that need be said, as to the primary importance of the heavenly Sion, and the world to come; and taking all this for granted, and passing it over as conceded, I shall proceed in my own way to talk of Ireland, its condition, and its requirements.

I repeat, then, that our object is to render Ireland a country meet for the habitation of Irishmen. This at present it is not. Let its statesmen reside at the seat of government. Let that be London. I am no repealer. I glory in the idea of an extended empire. That empire must have a British centre; and as Irishmen give their share of the blood and treasure necessary to its maintenance and to its spread, they should, in the proper locality, enjoy their share of the privilege and of the advantages that are connected with its government. We could well afford the temporary and necessary absence of our native statesmen. They are but the servants of the community. But let us have a home, an honourable and an honoured home, for our

own great men—for our divines, our philosophers, and our orators—for those masters in the various departments of genius, science, and art, who are born and reared on Irish ground, and who are marked by the peculiarities of our own beloved land. There is a peculiarity in the Irish mind, in the Irish countenance, in the Irish music, in the Irish soil, in the aspect of everything Irish. Improved, polished, developed, carried out, our peculiarities are not without their charm. It is melancholy that they should not be able to flourish and to grow—to enjoy themselves and be enjoyed at home; it is the duty of a Christian patriot to labour that they should.

I hold it as a great mistake to imagine that Irishmen can make England their arena. They may prosper there and be admired; but they will ever feel themselves strangers in a strange land.

The English temper is peculiarly national—and it is the disposition of Englishmen in general, for there are exceptions, however they may award their meed of praise to the merits of Irish residents in their country, to feel that in doing this they exercise a sort of toleration, and that, for the exercise of it, they are entitled to the credit of generosity.

It is delightful to one of us to live in England—to participate in the charms of a society liberal, enlightened, and highly civilised—to dwell in the midst of a people religious, rational, and dignified—true, faithful, and sincere—active, enterprising, and powerful. To be as it were ingrafted among them, and to be regarded as one of themselves, is ground for gratitude and satisfaction. But then to go abroad, and whenever you meet a degraded victim of misery—loathsome, through rags, penury, and ignorance, to be compelled to recognise a countryman of your own, to acknowledge that he is but a specimen of the inhabitants of your native land—it blights all your comfort! and further to recollect that it was the spirit of Englishmen which, under God, redeemed their country from the prevalence of similar wretchedness; that it was devotion to the death that eradicated from Britain that very principle of moral evil which invests the Irish race with degradation; that it was the blazing of English clergymen in the faggots of Smithfield; that it was their immovable determination to banish mortal error from their soil; that it was this which gave their posterity a country, and that you, instead of labouring with like power, perseverance, and devotedness at home, choose rather, easily, to walk into the green pastures and lie down beside the still waters which others won, while you have surrendered your own land without a struggle to the abomination that maketh desolate, strikes you cold at the heart, and compels you to confess that though you may have escaped, as an individual, the blight that has smitten your country, you are to a certain extent chargeable with the terrific misery in which it involves your countrymen. This creates a consciousness of unworthiness, a sort of participation in the degraded condition which you deplore, and embitters the felicity that you might be supposed to enjoy.

The English temper is peculiarly national—and a national temper is in general mingled with a sort of jealousy. Perhaps courtesy will prevent its expression; yet still it will make itself felt; nay, such is the character of the human heart, that peradventure the Englishman will scarcely think that he entertains the jealousy I speak of, and it will not manifest itself in polite circles—not at least in the displeasing hue which is its proper characteristic. What you will hear is language of sympathy, of pity, of compassion. “How melancholy the condition of poor Ireland!” “We must do something for the starving Irish!” “We are certainly to blame for the condition of your unhappy country!” “I really do not know what we shall do for your poor country!” This may be the language of generosity; he, however, will not have the heart of a Christian, who will not in the hearing of it take blame to himself—who will not reflect, “The fathers of these men bequeathed to them a land of privilege; is it not disgraceful that we should transmit to our children an inheritance of tears?”

The temper of Englishmen is peculiarly national—why should they not be jealous that Irishmen should intrude within their cultivated borders? The lower ranks, with unsophisticated candour, give utterance to this sentiment; it will be found more or less to pervade all classes; it will say, although not in so many words, to the Irish settler, “Why should you encroach here? why do you not make a country for yourselves? why do you eat the bread of our brethren?” When resident in England I perceived this, I felt a sort of inconsistency in expressing great zeal against Popery there, when I allowed it to plunder and devastate at home—I say I felt this, yea, with an excruciating sensibility; but I was far from blaming it. Though it stung me, I admired it. I saw in it the ingredient of the general prosperity. I felt that the slobbering, slovenly way in which we Irishmen drawled out our dislike to Popery, declaimed against it in bombastic oratory, or mouthed our complaints before an English audience, was as different from, and as much beneath the silent energy, the immovable tenacity with which the Riddleys, Latimers, and the Cranmers grasped, and shook, and strangled the monster, though they perished themselves in the mortal struggle, as day was from night, as hell was from heaven; and although a poor, miserable, and weak creature, the consideration determined the path wherein I should walk. Irish Protestants must utterly renounce the idea of making England their country; they must make a country for themselves. There is an immensity that they will admire in England, and if they be men of merit, England will concede to them the admiration they are entitled to, and reward them for it; they may find friends, nay lovers, amongst her people; but for *national* love, for national cordiality, for the indescribable and inappreciable outpourings of national affection and national sympathy, unconnected with “ifs” and “buts,” and provisoos—for these they must look to Old Ireland, Green Erin, the land of song, of sunshine, and hilarity—the land, also, alas! of broken hearts and broken fortunes; and why? because it is covered through its length, and

through its breadth, by the shadow of the wings of the Roman vampire. But why should not this monster be slain? Our Protestant people hire themselves for a shilling a day to stand the shot of our imperial foes. Should they not be willing to lay down their lives in order to make the beloved land of their birth the land of their delights? We want the spirit of martyrs; this, under God, can expel Popery,—and then, blessed be God! we shall have a country for ourselves, and leave one to our children.

Let us *admire* England—let us seek to emulate the firmness of her sons; we can, however, only *love* our native land. Let us glorify God in the fires, as ancient Englishmen did, and then we can, without let or drawback, admire and love her too.

I should be exceedingly concerned if the above line of observation led to the idea that I thought there was a want of thoroughness in the friendship which an Irish settler in England may receive at the hands of Englishmen; that there was a churlishness or narrowness about the English character; that their love towards an Irish friend must needs be darkened by something of a provincial shade. Could I, above all men, give utterance to such a sentiment, I should be *far gone*—a man without a heart, base and ungrateful.

Never did I experience friendship more solid, more unsparing, more cordial, more affectionate, than I enjoyed among beloved English friends. Let us detest the vulgar bigotry that depreciates the English character. That character is noble and generous, fraught with all the seeds that develope themselves into fine qualities. The English are, beyond a doubt, the first nation in the world. I admire and esteem them, and I experience towards a cherished circle of them an affection that throbs with every pulse of my heart; moreover, until Ireland can boast of such names as those of Milton and Shakespeare, Newton and Mede, let us abandon the vain pretension of thinking to measure the developed genius of Ireland with that of England. Until a race of Latimers have liberated our native mind, (for we have little need of Hampdens or Sydneys; were we liberated from *mental* thralldom, we should find ourselves through the patriotism of Englishmen possessed of *constitutional* privileges,) let us not presume to talk of comparing Irish with English self-sacrificing devotedness. England is a glorious country, and Englishmen present as fine specimens of humanity as exist or have existed; that Irishman is a grovelling creature, who would take up a taunt against the sister land. And he is ill-natured or ill-informed who would breathe a sentiment attributing an admixture of coolness to the friendship to be found amongst its people. Far be such sentiment from me! I have merely been speaking of the *national* mind of England. I blame it not for setting a higher value upon Englishmen than upon any others. I little wonder that there should be suspicion of fickleness or want of depth when the Irish character is in question. It may be in the orderings of Providence that there should be a peculiar attachment to our own fellow-countrymen; nor would I, as a stranger, trace that attachment, did I

recognise it, to a selfish or unworthy spirit. Since, however, it exists, since it is in the nature of man, I reiterate the thought, that if we would be happy we must concentrate our energies upon "home, sweet home!" I trust then, that I may not be misunderstood as influenced by anti-English feelings, because of possessing a stronger love towards Ireland than I can feel for England or all the world beside; nay, for this I would claim, and feel certain that I should receive the praise of Englishmen themselves.

There is, however, a considerable antagonism between the English and the Irish character; let each be improved, refined, Christianised, and developed, to the utmost; they would be both admirable, but in different ways. One would be more stately and severe, the other more graceful and condescending. Both would excite admiration; one would, however, rather repel from its dignity, the other attract by its grace. The divine would seek to make both as subservient as possible to the glory of his Master; he would not labour to eradicate peculiarities and assimilate qualities, perhaps, essentially diverse, but to improve and make the most of each.

There is one of our bishops, he is an Englishman, so exceedingly grave in his deportment, that, without the slightest intention of being other than kind, one feels in his presence a chill which strikes to the very marrow. This divine has written books, and some of them, moreover, good books. In respect of moral teaching, they are as pure as the icicle, and as cold, too. They never fail, however, when the opportunity allows, to make a thrust at the Irish temperament. "Levity," "jesting that is not convenient," would, from the lips of such a man, be attributed to the finest sallies of as brilliant a genius as Swift; and no doubt, were his character in other respects chaste as the unsunned snow, he would be informed by our phlegmatic prelate that he could expect nothing at his hands. There is another of our prelates, also an Englishman, and though not remarkable for English reserve, as I have heard, certainly characterised by national qualities quite as distinct.

The disposition of the English is towards the solid—so jealous of sterling excellence that it seems hostile to anything like adornment, lest that might be supposed as intended as a garnish for something worthless in itself. Hence English preachers are not only not orators, but they would seem to shrink from the character, as though it would involve an imputation of want of real excellence on their part. Still, why should not truth come recommended by an ornate statement of it? Why should breadth of view, or depth of feeling, or power of faith, be manifested in a chit-chat conversational pulpit essay? Or is it to be understood that, because great ability may choose this homely style, such a style can add anything in the way of recommendation to those empty commonplaces which are alone the staple of inferior intellect?

Such would appear to be the sentiment of the English divine whom I have now under consideration; with whose heterogeneous abilities

and learned skill, in every science but one, the British court has favoured our island, unworthy to sustain so brilliant a specimen of genius and scholarship ! His example has changed the preachers of his diocese from, perhaps, declaimers, into such mere retailers of theological prattle, that in hearing almost any of them you experience just that sort of satisfaction that you would if you heard a lolling school-boy gabble forth an assigned exercise. They certainly avoid the vice of "Irish oratory," without, however, having obtained the virtue of English sense. Now, thus to extend us poor Irishmen on a Procrustean bed, compelling us on the one hand to screw up our levity and hilarious disposition to the profound gravity of the gravest of all grave Englishmen ; or else, on the other, to compress our exuberance into the narrow dimensions which a philosopher might think sufficient for his oracular profundity, and to recommend it by no more elevated discourse than his own, would seem to involve an amount of British nationality more honoured in the breach than the observance, and which might as well have been left on the other side of the water. With all their lofty pretension, such characters are stamped with the vulgarity of British feeling—a vulgarity, (and I may add, a narrow-mindedness,) as great as that which is manifested in the anti-English tirades of the *Nation*, or the "gems" which "young Ireland" is so fond of gathering from the literary stores of our country.

Ireland is essentially degraded by Popery. In religious matters the degradation is *primâ facie*. To see grown men submitting themselves to the glaring impositions of a foreign priesthood ; buying up such legends as those of "St. Philomene ;" paying their money for such toys scapulars, *Agnus Dei*s, and blessed rings ; fancying that by such charms they can be protected from ills of mind or body, is melancholy in the extreme. But the degradation is not confined to religious matters, it is universal ; it perverts the judgment ; it blinds the intellect ; it corrupts every department of science, art, and literature.

Look, for example, at our national picture of "The blind girl at the holy well." As a work of art it is beautiful—very. It displays pictorial genius and ability of a superior order. But was the design of the admirable artist to bring into relief, by the effort of his pencil, our national misery ? Mark the perverted affection and the dark superstition of the tearful mother, as she leads her poor child to bend beneath the shrine of the crucifix and "the lucky horse-shoe !" Then glance at the other national picture, "The beggar's novice." Observe the cringe of the beautiful young mendicant, "with her shocking bad hat," and reflect upon the state of society where such scenes, though habitual, are not loathsome. Look also at "The Arran fisherman's dead child," and the hopeless despair, unmixed with a ray of spiritual enlightenment, which rings the bosoms of the benighted spectators ; and, last of all, we have "The cup-tosser." What a picture of misled energy is beautifully depicted at once in the countenance of the sorceress and her victim ! Analogous characteristics sadden us in

the review of almost every one of our national achievements in art; most of them manifest a people degraded by Popery. Let others alarm Irishmen by the murderous designs of a wide-spread ribbon conspiracy. Such evidences as these of the withering effects of prevalent superstition move me, at least, much more.

But let us turn to our national poetry. A volume of our "ballads," and another of our "songs," have issued lately from the press. The volumes are creditably got up, and constitute items in a series called "The Library of Ireland," published by Mr. Duffy, (not him of the *Nation*,) a most enterprising, and, I am glad to say, a most successful man of business. The first is graced by a prefatory essay from the pen of Mr. Duffy, of "the *Nation*," a gentleman of distinguished ability, and an eloquent writer. He descants in an indignant tone on the representations of debased human nature which ordinary poets and dramatic writers have identified with Irishmen. He repudiates the sentiments which they have attributed to our countrymen, and talks in a lofty tone of the genuine Irish character, and of the expression of Irish feeling, when separated, as it should be, from blunder and extravagance, declaring that his object by the publication of "The ballad poetry of Ireland" was to improve the national mind, refine the national taste, and rescue both from the misrepresentations of caricaturists. One or two short extracts will indicate his spirit and intention.

"There is an anglo-Irish language, as easily discriminated from London English as the dialect of Saxon spoken in the lowlands of Scotland. This is not the gibberish of bulls and broken English, the 'Teddy, my jewels' and 'Paddy, my joys,' which abound in the caricatures of Irish songs. It is a dialect rich with the restless imagination, and coloured with the strong passions of our nation.

"Irish songs ought to be, and the best of them are, as markedly Irish, even in language, as those of Burns or Motherwell are Scotch. (Page 22.)

"Let us hope that our native ballads will herald the happy coming of a native literature. They are not agents unworthy of such an end. With the old British ballads we make no comparison that does not imply their superiority in many respects. It is undoubtedly to their inspiration we owe nearly our entire collection, with the exception of translations. The thought of making ballads was borrowed, as the thought of making coined money was borrowed; but the gold is native, and the impress of our own nation is distinctly stamped upon each specimen. The world-famous German ballads were suggested by the same models, and if, like them, our ballads frequently exceed the originals in force and variety, as they naturally do in artistic effects, it is all that was possible to accomplish. You cannot manufacture antiques. To us it seems certain that success at home is all they require to take their place permanently among the ballad poetry of Europe.

"But they must have this passport to other nations.

"No generation of men has grown up with their sad, sweet music sounding in their ears, kindling lofty sentiments in the fresh heart of

youth, and keeping manliness and natural piety warm in the breast of manhood. They may be received, as it is received throughout the world, as the genuine voice of the country, and relieve us from the reproach (which we suffer wherever the English language prevails) of having produced no other native songs than the caricature and nonsense that represent Irish ballad poetry at present." (Page 37—38.)

Again,

"What poets they [the natives of Ireland] shall read and love is no immaterial question; very much the contrary. Poetry has been named the 'sister of religion,' a presumptuous title; but it is impossible to deny that it often lies like a quickening compost at the root of faith and morals. Operating on our feelings, the centre of weakness and sensibility, it has us at its will, and must inevitably be a great curse or a great blessing. Sometimes it is a curse; the dramatists and versifiers of the restoration were panders to the meanest vices, and our own generation has not been without a taint of the same poison. But the best poetry of every age purifies and elevates, and is the parent of noble impulses and great achievements. Its influence is of unmixed good; a law within the law; and the narrowest Utilitarian might admit it into his scheme of popular improvement as a distinct and powerful element of good." (Page 39—40.)

And, again,

"In preparing the volume for the press, all ballads on Irish subjects written by Englishmen, and all ballads on English or foreign subjects written by Irishmen, have been omitted. The subjects and the authors are exclusively national.

"Another class entirely excluded are the slang songs, imitating supposed Irish peculiarities which Irishmen exhibit upon the stage, but nowhere else on the surface of the earth. In a farce, a lawyer is always a knave, a doctor always a quack, and an Irishman always a professional rake, who talks a conventional jargon, interlarded with 'my joy' and 'my jewel;' speaks of a 'pistol as a mighty pretty tool;' kisses every woman, and cudgels or challenges every man he meets. The slang songs are the versified language of this stage Irishman, and bear as much resemblance to the dialect of the peasantry who till our fields, or the squires who possess them, as the stage lawyer does to Mr. Pigot and Mr. Henn, or the stage doctor to Dr. Stokes and Dr. Corrigan. Though these songs have obtained a disgraceful popularity in Ireland, there are none of them in this collection." (Page 41—42.)

These are elevated sentiments. They denote aspirations after great things; a contempt and abhorrence for that which is weak, absurd, or vile.

Mr. Michael Joseph Barry, who edits the "Songs of Ireland," dedicating them to Thomas Moore, adopts in his preface the views which had been laid down by Mr. Duffy in his introduction to the former volume. "The same sentiments controlled," says Mr. Barry, "the same principles guided my selection, which coerced or regulated his

[Mr. Duffy's]. Like him I have of course rejected those songs which were un-Irish in their character or language; and those miserable slang productions, which, representing the Irishman only as a blunderer, a bully, a fortune-hunter, or a drunkard, have done more than anything else to degrade him in the eyes of others, and far worse, to debase him in his own—making him but too often the abject thing that he was painted, and forcibly illustrating the words of Pope:—

‘Vice is a monster of such frightful mien,
As to be hated needs but to be seen;
But seen too oft, familiar with her face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace.’

“The mischief which these vile things have done, is indeed incalculable.” (Page 5—6.)

Here, then, we have two men of talent labouring in the cause of Ireland, engaged in the work of elevating and refining the popular mind, giving us to understand that they were alive to the beauties and defects of the poetry which was considered Irish, and that they designed to treat the reading public to a selection illustrative of the merits which they prized, and clear of those vices which they deprecated; surely we might expect after such language as this, evidences of a chastened judgment on the part of the selectors, and the exclusion of anything that was not in keeping with the expectation which they led us to think would be fulfilled. I admit that there are some charming things in both volumes; fine painting and touching sentiment, of which I had, perhaps, better not particularise the instances; but the vein of superstition, the depth of moral darkness which pervades the mass is deplorable, and produces the same melancholy feeling in the mind, with which it is oppressed, in viewing, for example, the pictures that I have spoken of. The collections, however, were intended for educational purposes, to elevate the national mind, to vindicate the character of the people from the imputation of absurdity, and to present it in a dignified attitude.

What think you, reader of the following specimen?—

SHULE AROON.

I would I were on yonder hill,
’Tis there I’d sit and cry my fill,
And every tear would turn a mill,
Is go de tu mo vourneen slàn.
Shule, shule, shule aroon,
Shule go succir, agus shule go cuin,
Shule go den darrus agus eligh glám,
Is go de tu mo vourneen slàn.

I’ll sell my rock, I’ll sell my reed,
I’ll sell my only spinning wheel,
To buy for my love a sword of steel,
Is go de tu mo vourneen slàn.

Chorus.

I'll dye my petticoats, I'll dye them red,
And round the world I'll beg my bread,
Until my parents shall wish me dead,
Is go de tu mo vourneen slàn.

Chorus.

I wish, I wish, I wish in vain,
I wish I had my heart again,
And vainly think I'd not complain,
Is go de tu mo vourneen slàn.

Chorus.

But now my love has gone to France,
To try his fortune to advance;
If he e'er come back 'tis but a chance,
Is go de tu mo vourneen slàn.

Chorus.

There you have a picture of a despairing lover dissolved in tears, yet so ridiculous in her grief, that everything like a feeling of sympathy is swallowed up by contempt for the poor creature who blunders forth her groans.

Then, again, what think you of the following, particularly when you consider it in the light of Mr. Duffy's deprecation of that which partakes of caricature of Irish peculiarities?

MOLLY CAREW.

Och hone! and what will I do?
Sure my love is all crost
Like a bud in the frost;
And there's no use at all in my going to bed,
For 'tis *dhramas* and not sleep that comes into my head,
And 'tis all about you,
My sweet Molly Carew—
And indeed 'tis a sin and a shame!
You're complater than Nature
In every feature,
The snow can't compare
With your forehead so fair,
And I rather would see just one blink of your eye,
Than the prettiest star that shines out of the sky,
And by this and by that,
For the matter o' that,
You're more distant by far than that same!
Och hone! *weirasthu!*
I'm alone in this world without you.

Och hone! but why should I spake
Of your forehead and eyes,
When your nose it defies
Paddy Blake, the schoolmaster, to put it in rhyme,
Tho' there's one BURKE, he says, that would call it sublime,
 &c. &c.

Och hone! by the man in the moon,
 You taze me all ways
 That a woman can plaze,
 For you dance twice as high with that thief, Pat Magee,
 As when you take share of a jig, dear, with me,
 &c. &c.

Of course this humorous production would not be out of place among the compositions which Mr. Duffy describes in the passage already quoted as fit only for rejection. But is it possible to conceive its publication in "The Library of Ireland," and with an educational purpose, without admitting that the Irish mind is astray?

The following is in a very different strain; it is certainly not absurd, but what a spirit of malignity does it breathe forth against scriptural education, and against those who promote it. The testimony which it lends to the faithfulness of those who are striving to shake off the moral night-mare that oppresses our country, is not unimportant. In point of perverted affection and darkened intellect, it produces the same feeling in the mind that one derives from viewing the heart-broken mother in the picture of "The blind girl at the holy well." *Bouchelleen Bawn*, means, "My Little fair boy."

BOUCHELLEEN BAWN.

And where are you going, *ma bouchelleen bawn*,
 From father and mother so early at dawn?
 Och! rather run idle from evening till dawn,
 Than darken *their* threshold, *ma bouchelleen bawn!*

For there they would tell you, *ma bouchelleen bawn*,
 That the mother whose milk to your heart you have drawn,
 And the father who prays for you, evening and dawn,
 Can never be heard for you, *bouchelleen bawn.*

That the faith we have bled for, from father to son,
 Since first by a lie our fair valleys were won,
 And which oft in the desert, our knees to the sod,
 We kept from them all, for our sons and our God—

That this was idolatry, heartless and cold,
 And now grown more heartless because it is old;
 And for something that's newer they'd ask you to pawn
 The creed of your fathers, *ma bouchelleen bawn!*

And now *will* you go to them, *bouchelleen bawn*,
 From father and mother so early at dawn?
 Och! the cloud from your mind let it never be drawn,
 But cross not *their* threshold, *ma bouchelleen bawn!*

Mr. Duffy had the liberality of feeling to include in his collection of ballads a few Protestant ones; each of these is free from nonsense; it breathes manly sentiment, and produces the conviction that if Ireland were Protestant, though we might wish for compositions more spiritual in their tone, we would not, at least, have to blush for the ballads of

our country. Some of my readers may never have read our celebrated Protestant ballad of "The Battle of the Boyne," and might wish to put it in contrast with the preceding. I here reprint it, therefore, from the collection before me:—

THE BATTLE OF THE BOYNE.

July the first, in Oldbridge town,
There was a grievous battle,
Where many a man lay on the ground,
And the cannons they did rattle.
King James he pitch'd his tents, between
The lines for to retire :
But King William threw his bomb-balls in,
And set them all on fire.

Thereat enraged, they vowed revenge
Upon King William's forces,
And oft did vehemently cry
That they would stop their courses ;
A bullet from the Irish came,
And grazed King William's arm,
They thought his majesty was slain,
But it did him little harm.

Duke Schomberg then, in friendly care,
His King would often caution
To shun the spot where bullets hot
Retain'd their rapid motion ;
But William said, " He don't deserve
The name of Faith's Defender,
Who would not venture life and limb
To make a foe surrender."

When we the Boyne began to cross,
The enemy they descended ;
But few of our brave men were lost,
So stoutly we defended ;
The horse was first that marched o'er,
The foot soon followed after ;
But brave Duke Schomberg was no more,
By venturing over the water.

When valiant Schomberg he was slain,
King William he accosted
His warlike men for to march on,
And he would be the foremost ;
" Brave boys," he said, " be not dismayed,
For the loss of one commander,
For God will be our King this day,
And I'll be General under."

Then stoutly we the Boyne did cross,
To give the enemy battle ;
Our cannon to our foes' great cost,
Like thunder claps did rattle.

In majestic mien our Prince rode o'er ;
 His men soon follow'd after,
 With blows and shouts put our foes to the rout
 The day we cross'd the water.

The Protestants of Drogheda
 Have reason to be thankful,
 That they were not to bondage brought,
 They being but a handful.
 First to the Tholsel they were brought,
 And tried at the Millmount after ;
 But brave King William set them free,
 By venturing over the water.

The cunning French near to Dulceek
 Had taken up their quarters,
 And fenced themselves on every side,
 Still waiting for new orders ;
 But in the dead time of the night,
 They set the fields on fire,
 And long before the morning light,
 To Dublin they did retire.

Then said King William to his men,
 After the French departed,
 "I'm glad (said he) that none of ye
 Seem to be faint-hearted ;
 So sheathe your swords and rest awhile,
 In time we'll follow after."
 Those words he utter'd with a smile
 The day he cross'd the water.

Come let us all with heart and voice
 Applaud our lives' defender,
 Who at the Boyne his valour showed
 And made his foe surrender.
 To God above the praise we'll give,
 Both now and ever after ;
 And bless the glorious memory
 Of King William that cross'd the water.

That is certainly a sturdy old ballad ; though rough, it is manly and sensible ; indeed, in more than one stanza, at least, it rises to the sublime.

"A bullet from the Irish came,
 And grazed King William's arm,
 They thought his majesty was slain,
 Yet, it did him little harm."

I do not know that I admire the term "his majesty" anywhere, more than I do in this verse. It speaks "deliberate valour" in the troops of the king ; there is a soberness, a quietness, a consideration in the phrase, which, without appearing intended to convey the idea that the troops of William were unexcited and undisturbed, produces a deep feeling that they were ; and then the solicitude of Schom-

berg about his prince's safety, and the religious magnanimity of that prince himself, together with his high and holy purpose, are well conveyed in the following verse :

“ Duke Schomberg then, in friendly care,
 His king would often caution,
 To shun the spot where bullets hot
 Retain'd their rapid motion.
 But William said, “ He don't deserve
 The name of Faith's Defender,
 Who would not venture life and limb
 To make a foe surrender.”

Perhaps this sounds too loudly of the “ drum ecclesiastic,” but it is the spirit of the king, rather than the last line put into his mouth, by which we are to judge of him. The conduct and language of William, on the death of Schomberg, are finely given:—

When valiant Schomberg he was slain,
 King William he accosted
 His warlike men for to march on,
 And he would be the foremost.
 “ Brave boys,” he said, “ be not dismayed
 For the loss of one commander,
 For God will be our King this day,
 And I'll be General under.”

This is uncommonly fine, and just in keeping with the gratitude for victory ascribed in the last verse, to HIM who alone could bestow it:—

To God above the praise we'll give
 Both now and ever after,
 And bless the glorious memory
 Of King William that cross'd the water.

“ The Songs of Ireland,” which are likewise educationally intended, are stated to be gleaned of objectionable compositions. They contain the “ Groves of Blarney,” “ The night before Larry was stretched,” “ The Widow Malone,” “ When I was a boy in my father's mud edifice, tender and bare as a pig in a sty,” “ The Sprig of Shillelah,” “ The Rakes of Mallow,” and the following: I give it just as it is printed; the introduction of the vulgar adjuration is highly objectionable, and I would fain omit it. I trust that I may not be wrong in the conclusion that I have come to, that it ought to be set down; my serious conclusion, however, is, that it ought; it affords so strong an illustration of the truth which I am urging, that I think it should not be omitted; we abide under the promise that, “ though we drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt us,” a promise which I think is applicable in the present case. In order that we may be properly animated against the evil that we deplore, we should understand its nature, its depth, and its malignity.

WHAT CAN THE MATTER BE.

At sixteen years old you could get little good of me;
 Then I saw Norah—who soon understood of me,
 I was in love—but myself, for the blood of me,
 Could not tell what I did ail!
 'Twas dear, dear! what can the matter be?
 Och! blood an ouns! what can the matter be?
 Och! *grah ma chree!* what can the matter be?
 Bother'd from head to the tail!

I went to confess me to Father O'Flannigan;
 Told him my case—made an end—then began again;
 "Father," says I, "make me soon my own man again,
 If you can find out what I ail."
 "Dear, dear," says he, "what can the matter be?"
 Och, blood an ouns! can you tell what, &c.
 Bother'd from head to the tail.

Soon I fell sick—I did bellow and curse again;
 Norah took pity to see me at nurse again;
 Gave me a kiss; och, zounds! that threw me worse again:
 Well she knew what I did ail.
 "But, dear, dear!" says she, &c.

'Tis long ago now since I left Tipperary—
 How strange, growing older, our natures should vary!
 All symptoms are gone of my ancient quandary,
 I cannot tell now what I ail.
 "Dear, dear!" says she, &c.

Such is a specimen of the poetry which is intended, by extensive circulation in our country, to raise the character of her sons, and to place that character in a favourable light before the reading world. I ask, is the perversion of intellect which can expect such consequences from such causes, reconcileable with any other hypothesis than this, that the moral atmosphere which we breathe is polluted by a corrupt religious system. By way of contrast to the above, I here lay before my readers a celebrated old Scotch song; let them mark the fine tone of moral feeling, of conjugal and parental affection, of household decency and good sense, which it gives utterance to throughout. In this, as well as in the preceding cases, save one, I have chosen specimens untinged by any religious colouring; they indicate, indeed, the character of the prevalent religion, for it is that which determines the state of a national mind. All classes of society will exhibit marks of the influence of the predominant religion, and will be rational or absurd, pure or corrupt, thoughtful or inconsiderate, according to the mental habitude which that religion induces, and it is proper that the mind of thinking men, if they will not value religion for itself, should be brought to consider its bearing upon the character of the people upon whom it operates.

THE HUSBAND'S RETURN.

And are ye sure the news is true ?
 And are ye sure he's weel ?
 Is this a time to talk o' wark,
 Mak haste, set by your wheel.
 Is this a time to talk o' wark,
 When Colin's at the door ?
 Gie me my cloak, I'll to the quay,
 And see him come ashore.

For there's nae luck about the house,
 There's nae luck ava;
 There's little pleasure in the house,
 When our gudeman's awa'.

Rise up, and mak a clean fireside,
 Put on the mickle pot;
 Gie little Kate her cotton gown,
 And Jock his Sunday's coat :
 And mak their shoon as black as slaes,
 Their hose as white as snaw;
 It's a' to please my ain gudeman,
 For he's been lang awa.

For there's nae luck, &c.

There are twa hens upon the bank,
 Have fed this month and mair,
 Mak haste and thraw their necks about,
 That Colin weel may fare ;
 And spread the table neat and clean,
 Gar ilka thing look braw;
 It's a' for love of my gudeman,
 For he's been long awa.

For there's nae luck, &c.

O gie me down my bigonet,
 My bishop-satin-gown,
 For I maun tell the baillie's wife,
 That Colin's come to town.
 My Sunday's shoon they maun gae on
 My hose o' pearl blue,
 It's a' to please my ain gude man,
 For he's baith leal and true.

For there's nae luck, &c.

Sae true's his words, sae smooth's his speech,
 His breath's like caller air,
 His very foot has music in't,
 When he comes up the stair.
 And will I see his face again ?
 And will I hear him speak ?
 I'm downright dizzy wi' the thought;
 In troth I'm like to greet.

For there's nae luck, &c.

The cauld blasts of the winter wind,
 That thrilled through my heart,
 They're a' blawn by, I hae him safe;
 Till death we'll never part:
 But what puts parting in my head?
 It may be far awa:
 The present moment is our ain,
 The neist we never saw.

For there's nae luck, &c.

Since Colin's weel, I'm weel content,
 I hae nae mair to crave;
 Could I but live to mak him blest,
 I'm blest aboon the lave.
 And will I see his face again?
 And will I hear him speak?
 I'm downright dizzy wi' the thought;
 In troth I'm like to greet.

For there's nae luck, &c.

My readers will, of course, understand, as before stated, that it is anything but my intention to represent the above as a religious composition. I design it merely as an illustration of the household tone, the domestic affection, the decency, and the common sense which grow and flourish in a society which is presided over by true religion; and to mark the contrast between these feelings and those which prevail in a community infected by Popery, it is impossible to read this beautiful ballad, and to realize the sensations of the thrifty but loving wife without largely participating in the exquisite emotions of joy and delight with which the author has endued her. I am quite sure that this was no imaginative composition. It was a sketch from nature. The poet is sitting at the hearthstone of the "gudewife" when the news is brought in with respect to the arrival of her husband! and he beholds the ecstasy of feeling which the intelligence creates—the heartfelt love, at once conjugal and parental—the deep anxiety to please, so engrossing that it brought contempt upon all minor considerations; the haste to spread the news, to welcome the lover, (for the existence of a graver relationship abates not one jot the genuine passion depicted,) the enthusiasm which at its greatest height, chastened by good sense, does not even verge towards extravagance. He beholds all this; he hears the directions given, and marks their spirit; in a word, with the genius of a true poet, he takes possession of the woman's soul; and, with tears in his eyes, he indites his stanzas, giving utterance through every line,

"In thoughts that breathe, and words that burn,"

to the sentiments of a refined and civilised nature, habitually disciplined by truthful sentiments, and none others. The scene so graphically brought before us is Protestant all through, and makes itself felt as such. I find it utterly impossible to conceive the thing as connected with the household in which the mind is fixed on scapu-

lars, waxen gospels, holy candles, and rotten bones, attributed to saints; such artificial stuff as this is cannot be connected with a wholesome state of general feeling; there will be meanness in poverty, tawdriness in prosperity; and if the feeling be genuine, uncontrolled by reason, it will degenerate into the extravagant; and instead of those gushing tears of joy with which every spectator weeps in sympathy, we shall have such language, as

Every tear will turn a mill!

some such exaggeration of expression as shall absorb the affectionate in the ridiculous.

How exceedingly beautiful is the second stanza!

Rise up, and mak a clean fire-side,
Put on the mickle pot;
Gie little Kate her cotton gown,
And Jock his Sunday's coat :
And mak their shoon as black as slaes,
Their hose as white as snaw;
It's a' to please my ain gudeman,
For he's been long awa.
For there's nae luck, &c.

Lovely and admirable! little Kate in cotton gown, and Jock in Sunday coat, stand right before you from top to toe, spick and span; they have almost forgotten their long-absent father; rather confusion of face before one whose arrival manifested him as a person of such great importance, than very intelligent expression, is apparent in them; but beneath the bashfulness, which will soon wear off, there is a profundity of affection—"He is our own father!" "We have a father like Will and Sal!" "He loves us, and he loves mither, and he will keep and protect us all!" and then the heart of the wife as she reads love and appreciation in her husband's countenance! and *his* gratitude that he should have been allowed to live and witness such a scene! you realize it all, and you perceive distinctly that the thing is Protestant.

The fourth stanza is also rich in characteristic excellencies. While the ballad clearly convinces us that the family were of the humble rank, we see that they were no grovelling peasants; the loving and affectionate housewife is on friendly terms with the baillie's wife; she calculates on her cordial participation in those feelings of joy which overpower herself, but there will be no unceremonious gossip between them. She will go dressed in the best fashion on her delightful errand. Upon the whole, from beginning to end, we realize a state of society in which humble life is invested with fine common sense and conscious dignity. And this can only be the case where all are invited to contemplate the Deity eye to eye, where religion is understood, without levelling the classes, to have a sort of equalising effect, which humbles without degrading, exalts without puffing up, and in every case refines, beautifies, harmonises.

Popery degrades Ireland; about that there can be no mistake.

CHAPTER II.

A VIEW OF THE DIVISIONS OF THE CHRISTIAN WORLD.

The consideration of the continued existence and increasing strength of Popery infers an improper mode of assailing it. Here is a system manifestly unscriptural, by general confession adverse to human liberty, and rendered to a great extent infamous by the history of the past; and yet we find it holding its ground, nay, progressing; successfully assailing a hostile system which is commended by the blessings that it has bestowed upon the world, and strictly conformable to the Word of God and to the primitive church: nay, more, we find this very Popery popular, while public odium or distaste to no inconsiderable degree encounters that church which is based upon the truth, and to which mankind are so largely debtors. How could this be, had the right mode of maintaining what is good and exposing what is evil been acted on? When Providence has not put honour on our warfare; when he has allowed it to issue in defeat; when we see our churches prostrated, our bishops curtailed in number, our congregations dispersed; when we see our constitutional privileges, rights, and liberties endangered, invaded, and surrendered, while at the same time our adversaries have made corresponding advances both in church and State, it becomes an inquiry of paramount importance, "Is there not a cause?" I think there is; I think that I have discovered that cause, namely, we have been fighting the battle of the church in an improper, and, therefore, in an ineffectual way; hence, instead of victory, we have had defeat; instead of triumph, we have had disgrace, and we have, in consequence, been losing ground instead of gaining it.

We have been glorifying half the truth, rather than the whole of it. We have been, indeed, assailing the weak points of Popery, but have at the same time, been allowing the church of Rome to occupy the strong positions of the church, and to glory in them as though they were peculiarly hers. We have been arguing about "the errors of Popery," as though under existing circumstances she savingly taught, at least, some truths; and in the total abandonment of the maintenance of church principles, we have allowed multitudes to suppose, that these could only be found in Rome. We have been exposing false doctrines, but neglecting the consideration of the body in which those false doctrines were inherent. We have been contending for Gospel truth, as though there were no church to promulgate it; and against Popish error, as though it were an inconcrete, disembodied, abstract evil. With

such mismanagement as this, our discomfiture is less wonderful than that it should not already have been final and irrevocable.

On these truths I insisted at large, in an essay on the mode of carrying on the Roman Catholic controversy, which, nine years ago, I prefixed to an edition of Mede's "Apostasy of the Latter Times." In the discussion with Father Maguire, the principles of controversy which I insisted on were amply tested, their force was proved to demonstration, and therefore that event should be considered to set at rest the question, and should lead every one of sound judgment to admit, that the path to victory against the Papists is no longer a thing to be discovered. The recapitulation of my views in the preceding pages, may, I trust, have the effect of still further elucidating the matter, and eventuate in a decision and uniformity of action against the enemy.

I have placed, as it were, face to face, the two great communities; the Catholic reformed church, the true church, the church of Christ, and the Catholic unreformed church, the Apostate church, the church of Antichrist. In order to complete victory against, and in the midst of all gainsayers, we should fight the battle of truth in, and with, the first of these churches, and against the other.

But there are some subordinate considerations connected with the chief one which require to be satisfactorily settled, lest those who are opposed to us should make use of them to embarrass the question, and thus to turn aside the pursuit, which should not only be kept up, but continued in one undeviating track.

To the true churches above mentioned, every other division of the moral world—the world considered as an aggregate of intelligent beings—as a gathering of minds, bears an intelligible relation. Protestants should understand this; they should be able promptly to assign its just character to every religious section of mankind.

We hear of "the Wesleyan church," of the "church of the old connexion of Methodists," and of the "church of the new connexion," or "the Kilhamites;" we hear of the "Independent church," the "Presbyterian church," the "Quaker church," the "Unitarian church," the "Baptist church," and that, again, has its sub-divisions. In Scotland there are "churches" without end—the "Free church," the "Secession church," &c., &c.; each of these "churches" we know to be separated from the other by strictly ascertained divisional lines. Though it cannot be denied that they hold much in common, it would be mere vanity to pretend that they are not on other points decidedly antagonistic. How, then, is all this reconcileable with the language which we employ every time we use, as we do every Sunday in church, the Nicene Creed, "I believe in One Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church." If we admit the churchhood of a myriad of bodies, that are anything but united among themselves, why do we talk of there being "one" church, and only one? Let us understand what we talk about; let us not use a vague, indefinite, and unmeaning language; let us see exactly whereabouts we are; let us not allow Papists in controversy to raise a dust on this score—to run us down with a charge of division amongst

ourselves; let us be able to take up the language of truth in respect to these moral phenomena, and by admitting excellence where it exists, while we ascertain the nature of the irregularity connected with it, keep ourselves clear of being open to an accusation of latitudinarianism on the one hand, or of illiberality on the other.

In discussing this subject, I shall have to recapitulate some thoughts previously expressed; it will divide itself thus:

We will consider,

First—That which is last in point of degree, the Anti-catholic and Apostatic Church.

Secondly—The Catholic and Apostolic Church.

Thirdly—Separating Sects.

First—*The Apostate Church*; that is, the Church of Rome. Strictly speaking, the Church of Rome is the single diocese of the Bishop of Rome. This church, when it became apostate, became the spiritual Babylon.

But the inseparable accompaniment of its apostasy was spiritual tyranny and domination. The inclination to encroachment, congenial to the carnal mind, and largely existing at Rome, found in other churches, through the prevalence of spiritual corruption, a preparedness for slavery.

The Holy Spirit is the true giver of liberty, just because He is the giver of wisdom. Wise men may safely be allowed freedom, for they will not abuse it; possessed of an infallible guide who dwells within, they will not surrender their discretion to others who cannot have an illumination superior to their own. In matters of order they will, indeed, submit to the conventional arrangements of the church, but in matters of faith they are taught of God; they are brought to a precise agreement with all true believers everywhere; they have no need that any man should teach them, but as the anointing teacheth them of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, even as it teacheth them, they abide in Him. (1 John, ii. 27).

But when the faith that enlighteneth the mind is departed from; when the Holy Spirit, insulted by something added to simple dependence upon Jesus Christ, takes his departure from individuals, or from churches, then darkness, weakness and folly predominate, and men never feel at ease until they have some one to lead them by the nose; conscious of inability in themselves to walk aright, they crave a leader, and they crouch before him.

Perhaps it would be difficult to illustrate the position which I have here assumed more clearly, than by a reference to Mr. Newman's last work, "*An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine.*" In that work he thus speaks of the necessity for a guide in religious matters:—"The common sense of mankind feels that the very idea of revelation implies a present informant and guide, and that an infallible one. Not a mere abstract declaration of truths not known before to man, or a record of history, or the result of any antiquarian

research, but a message and a lesson speaking to this man and that," [and such a "present informant and infallible guide," the Holy Spirit is. He is not "a mere abstract declaration of truths," &c., but precisely a person who delivers a "message and a lesson to this man and that." He is a living, speaking, potential witness; a moving, animating, guiding, and directing power—tried, however, since there are many spirits gone abroad into the world, by the voice of Scripture and the church. This living and infallible guide is obtained by faith alone in Christ Jesus; faith that tramples upon, and stains the glory of all merit but that of Christ alone. The Spirit obtained by such faith confers certainties, and removes everything like doubt in religion. Through the operation of that Spirit, the Bible becomes a pillar of light, and ceases to be a dead letter, which it is always considered to be by those who hold an adulterated doctrine of justification—that is, by all those who teach the doctrine of justification by works, or by the sacraments, instead of the doctrine of justification by faith only. Such a dead letter, Mr. Newman, of course, considers the Bible to be, as is evident by what follows]. "This is shown by the popular notion which has prevailed among us since the Reformation, that the Bible itself is such a guide, and which succeeded in overthrowing the supremacy of church and Pope, for the very reason that it was a rival authority, not resisting merely, but supplanting it. In proportion, then, as we find, in matter of fact, that the inspired volume is not calculated or intended to subserve that purpose, are we forced to revert to that living and present guide, which, at the era of her rejection, had been so long recognised as the dispenser of Scripture according to times and circumstances, and the arbiter of all true doctrine and holy practice to her children. We feel a need, and she alone of all things under heaven supplies it. We are told that God has spoken. Where? In a book. We have tried it, and it disappoints; it disappoints (that most holy and blessed gift) not from fault of its own, but because it is used for a purpose for which it was not given. The Ethiopian's reply, when St. Philip asked him if he understood what he was reading, is the voice of nature: 'How can I, unless some man shall guide me?' The church undertakes that office; she does what none else can do; and this is the secret of the power" (page 126). "You tried the Bible, and it disappointed!" Yes, sir. But why did it "disappoint?" because your trial was made in the rejection of the cardinal principle of the true church, to wit: the doctrine of justification by faith alone without the works of the law; you stumbled at that stumbling stone, and therefore it was, that you found the Bible a dead letter instead of a living word.

The Spirit of God alone enlightens the blind eyes.

That Spirit is obtained by faith alone in Christ.

Mr. Newman has rejected the doctrine of justification by faith alone, and, therefore, he is blind; hence he considers it a boon that the Pope should profess to be an infallible guide, and he submits to him accordingly.

He feels himself blind—that he is merely groping his way, and of course he expresses himself with all the humble subserviency of a blind man. In the preface to his book he informs us that he (the author) had just joined the Popish church, and he proceeds: "His first act on his conversion, was to offer his work for revision to the proper authorities; but the offer was declined on the ground that it was written and partly printed before he was a [Roman] Catholic, and that it would come before the reader in a more persuasive form if he read it as the author wrote it.

"It is scarcely necessary to add, that he now submits every part of the book to the judgment of the church, with whose doctrine, on the subject of which it treats, he wishes all his thoughts to be coincident" (page 11). What a total forfeiture of independence of mind does such language indicate! Can there be the least doubt, that if the community in general were brought to accord in sentiment with Mr. Newman, the liberty of the press would at once be abrogated? Men, in general, being brought to believe that they could only judge correctly under the guidance of the church, would intreat to be delivered from those false lights which must needs emanate from a press uncontrolled by an ecclesiastical censorship.

The Church of Rome, then, is apostate. Strictly speaking she constitutes herself the apocalyptical Babylon, but she has subdued a vast number of churches to her dominion; they acknowledge her supremacy, and bear her yoke, and at their head, and along with them, she composes an ecclesiastical empire, which constitutes one great church—the Roman Catholic, forming that which in the main is prophetically denominated, "Babylon the great." All who openly profess to belong to that church, and are called Roman Catholics, are said in Scripture to bear the brand of apostasy "on their forehead." But if men hold Popish principles, even, although they may not openly profess to be Roman Catholics, like Roman Catholics themselves, they are still accounted apostate; they are said, however, to be branded "in the right hand"—that is, their character is discovered rather by their actions than by their profession.

Prophecy gives us to understand that the Apostasy should, in a general way, infect all Christendom; and, accordingly, so it did. It likewise tells us, that in due season the protest against it, which should be at first individual in its character, pronounced by isolated witnesses, should eventuate in a reformation, even as it has actually done. And this brings us to consider

Secondly. *The Catholic and Apostolic Church.*

As may be gathered from what has been before expressed, this church consists in the aggregate of those communities which hold the apostles' doctrine and maintain apostolic fellowship; otherwise, which, while they preach the truth, have never become involved in an act of separation; these churches may be conveniently classed under three heads.

1st. Those which never submitted to Roman supremacy.

The Greek church, the Syrian church, founded by St. Thomas, the Waldensian church, and perhaps others, more or less pure, but still holding the head, may come under this division.

2ndly. Those which having been brought under the Church of Rome, have cast it off, and become reformed; of these there may be said to be two classes.

1st. Some have been reformed *in integro*, that is, not merely the laity, but the three orders of the clergy have embraced and submitted themselves to the truth. Such are the Episcopal churches of England, of Ireland, of Denmark, and of Sweden. In these churches, the apostolical derivation of authority, through distinct lines of prelates, is quite plain.

2ndly. Others, in the act of reformation, have lost their regularity of form. Thus, for example, the Scotch church is Presbyterian, so is the Lutheran church in Germany, and others of the Reformed churches abroad.

But then these Presbyterian churches are not *separating communities*. The Kirk of Scotland, is the very ancient Catholic church of that country reformed after the Presbyterian fashion. There can scarcely be a doubt, but that if the Scottish bishops at the time of the reformation, instead of resisting that great change, had fallen in with it, as the bishops did in England and Ireland, they would, as in those countries, have been placed at its head, and thus, the reformed church of Scotland, would have been Episcopal; and the same may be said of the foreign reformed churches which have adopted the Presbyterian discipline.

Since, however, these churches have never separated themselves, I cannot think that they have lost their claim to be regarded as the true Catholic churches of the countries in which they prevail.

They were bound to come out of Rome.

God himself commanded it. When they could not reform themselves regularly, they were bound to do it as best they might; and in consideration of the vital truth which they recovered, we may well overlook the informal manner in which the recovery was achieved.

I think the result has proved that the Episcopal form is more calculated to maintain unity than the Presbyterian. While in England there may be said to be only three considerable denominations of separatists, to wit, the Wesleyans, the Independents, and the Baptists, Scotland has all these; and many other divisions of separatists peculiar to itself. For example, the Free church, the United Secession struck, the Relief church, the Reformed Presbyterian church, the Original Secession church, &c., &c.

The Kirk of Scotland, however, established by law, is, as before stated, the old Catholic church of the country reformed—and it is so, not because it is established, but because it is not a separating community. Christ has commanded union among his disciples. In the case of Rome he has abrogated that law. Every Christian should “come out” of

Babylon—with his brethren, if possible,—if not, alone. Separation from Rome is no warrant for separation from a Reformed church, even though that church may have much that is corrupt in its members. We are not taught to expect perfection in a church. On the contrary, the church is compared to a net, which gathers good fish and bad, to a field which contains wheat and tares, and we are desired not to expect separation till the judgment. If the principle of separation be warranted upon ordinary grounds, unity is impossible—division should not be deprecated—schism is no impropriety. But if schism be an evil, separation improper, divisions to be deplored, then may those consider that they enjoy a high privilege who belong to a body which never separated, save from apostate Rome, and that on God's express command. The Church of England never separated, and it is therefore Catholic—the Church of Ireland never separated, and it is therefore Catholic—the Church of Scotland never separated, why not therefore Catholic? It may be informal, but it is not a sect. It may be irregular, but it is not chargeable with division. I repeat, again and again, that it is the ancient church of Scotland reformed according to the Presbyterian hypothesis; and so reformed because of the obstinacy of its quondam bishops.

3rd. Some Catholic churches are of post-reformational construction.

For example, a church has been planted in the United States of America, by the United Church of England and Ireland. Our church also has planted a church in India; it has planted a church in New Zealand; and it lengthens its cords whenever, in the legitimate method of missionary enterprise, it extends its connexion into foreign lands. The churches thus planted may extend their ramifications indefinitely. Other regularly reformed Catholic churches may have acted similarly to our own. For example, the Swedish or the Danish church.

In like manner, the Scotch church, or foreign Presbyterian churches may have planted branches of themselves in other lands.

Such newly-planted churches would receive the form, and be likely to imbibe the spirit of the churches from which they may have sprung.

The whole aggregate of Catholic and Apostolic churches, consisting of ancient Catholic churches, either independent of Rome, or separated from Rome and reformed, with their various legitimate offshoots, would constitute the one Catholic and Apostolic church of Christ.

Having spoken of the plantation of churches, I think it well to touch upon an important principle on the subject, which may be gathered from the Scriptures.

We are clearly taught by St. Paul that there is a spiritual relationship between the converted and those who convert them. "Though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many *fathers*; for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the Gospel, wherefore, I beseech you, be ye followers of me." (1 Cor. iv. 15, 16.) Again, addressing the Galatians, he says, "My little *children*, of whom

I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you, I desire to be present with you, &c." (Gal. iv. 19.) Addressing Timothy, he calls him "his own *son* in the faith." (1 Tim. i. 1.) His "dearly beloved *son*." (2 Tim. i. 2.) "This charge I commit unto thee, *son* Timothy." (1 Tim. i. 18.) "Thou, therefore, my *son*, be strong." (2 Tim. ii. 1.) And similar passages are found elsewhere in the Epistles.

We learn also that the existence of this relationship was connected with a sort of holy jealousy on the part of the spiritual father. He was unwilling that the affection which his spiritual children bore him should be alienated by others; and he was careful on his part to avoid intruding into folds that had been constructed independently of his exertions. "I will not dare (says he) to speak of any of those things which Christ has not wrought by me. I have so strived to preach the Gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation." (Rom. xv. 18, 20.) In like manner he speaks to the Corinthians. "Not boasting of things without our measure, that is, of other men's labours, but having hope to preach the Gospel in the regions beyond you, and not to boast in another man's line of things, made ready to our hand." (2 Cor. x. 15, 16.) Elsewhere, animadverting upon those who had intruded into the Galatian church, which he had planted, he says, "There be some that trouble you, who would pervert the Gospel of Christ." (Gal. i. 7.) And in that same Epistle, "I would they were even cut off which trouble you." (Gal. v. 17.)

From all which we learn,—

1st. That the intrusion of one church into the pastures of another is improper.

2nd. That such intrusion gives ground of anxiety to the party on whom it is made.

3rd. That it is connected with divisions and heart-burnings, and not unfrequently with erroneous doctrine.

Hence, our church would be inexcusable if it planted a branch, for example, in Sweden or Denmark, and attempted in these places to attract disciples to its own connexion.

I would ask whether, by parity of reasoning, there would not seem an impropriety in the plantation of an Episcopal church in Scotland? Surely the Kirk of Scotland holds and teaches the truth of the Gospel in its integrity, and that we should plant a church within its borders, would seem to be just that intrusion into "other men's line of things," which the apostle deprecates. By our encroachment into the Presbyterian pasture, we warrant their encroachment into ours; whereas, if we had avoided this encroachment—if our bishops had refused to originate an Episcopal church in a territory that was already cultivated by a Presbyterian church, that Presbyterian church being of apostolic origin, perhaps the Presbyterians would have kept out of our territory, or might even be disposed to take into consideration the propriety of themselves resuming the primitive or episcopal form of church government. I can scarcely think but that the Episcopal Church in

Scotland has something of the nature of a schism in it, and that, on the other hand, branches of the Scotch Presbyterians in England and Ireland partake of a like schismatical character. If matters of form afford me in Scotland a valid ground for refusing communion with the Scotch Church, why should not matters of form be regarded as a sufficient excuse for the secession of Dissenters amongst ourselves? It seems to me that both Scripture and ecclesiastical history, and the constitution of the human mind, place it beyond any manner of doubt, that the primitive form of church government was the Episcopalian. Who will, however, venture to say that the holding of "the head" is not a matter of greater importance than any form whatsoever? And if, when the head is held, one Catholic church fall out with another because of forms, it is little wonder that their own children should fall out with them on like grounds. Let Ephraim cease to envy Judah, and Judah to vex Ephraim, and perhaps the children of both will cease to be at variance with their parents. (Isaiah xi. 13.)

But we come to consider—

3rd. *Sects.*

When a community abandons the unity of the church, and forms itself into a *separate* body, it is called a "sect." The word sect properly means a thing cut off; and of sects there may be said to be two classes.

1st. Schismatical, and

2ndly. Heretical sects.

1. A sect is said to be *schismatical* when it has broken off from the unity of the church, still retaining doctrinal truth.

The word schism means a split; in its ecclesiastical employment, it signifies a body that has *split* off from the church.

The Wesleyan Methodists, for example, are said to be sound in doctrine; so are the Independents; so, on essential points, are the Baptists; but then, having broken off from the body of the church, we cannot avoid calling them schismatical.

There is, indeed, a body of Methodists in Ireland, a highly respectable and useful body, which cannot with any propriety of language be called schismatical; they are denominated church Methodists. Their members attend the service of the church. Their ministers claim no rank but that of laymen. They do not affect to administer the sacraments. They occupy the honourable position of helpers of the church of Christ. This body is not a *sect*; it is emphatically a "church society;" and happy would it be for the church if, as such, this pious body were recognised, adopted, employed, and its ministers admitted as lay-preachers (at the discretion of the bishops) to our pulpits.

The church Methodists, then, are not a sect without the church; they are a society within it.

A body of people, however, who *separate* from the church, while they do not repudiate its doctrines, constitute a schism.

One schism generates another, and this, again, a third, and so

on. The first may be called a primary schism, the next a secondary schism, and so on.

For example, the new connexion of Wesleyans, or the Kilhamites, have separated from the old connexion the original society of Wesley, and thus constitute a schism from a schism; that is, supposing soundness of doctrine to be still maintained. The old connexion would be a primary schism, the new connexion a secondary one.

2. When a body not only separates itself from the unity of the church, but renounces its doctrine, it is called an heretical body, or a heresy.

The word heresy means a *choosing*, and in its ecclesiastical use it indicates that the body to which it is applied, instead of being guided by the church into sound doctrine, *chooses* a doctrine for itself, or embraces that which has been chosen by an individual.

Very frequently the word heresy is appropriated to the *doctrine* of heretics, rather than to the body which they compose. Thus, we speak of the heresy of the Quakers,—meaning, rather, their unsound doctrine than the Quaker body. For the Quakers have not only broken from the unity of the Church, but they neglect the use of the sacraments, and inculcate principles otherwise unsound, hence they teach heresy, and they constitute a heresy.

The various sects of the so-called Unitarians, who deny the Deity of Christ, the Personality of the Holy Ghost, and the doctrine of original sin, are also heretics, although it may be questioned whether the extent and malignity of their doctrinal corruption should not cause them to be pronounced altogether *apostate* from the faith. For, when heretical pravity extends so far as to nullify the faith, as it does, for example, in the Church of Rome, it constitutes apostasy.

Heresy may engender heresy, as schism does schism. Thus Socinianism, which teaches that Christ is a man, grew out of Arianism, which teaches that he is an angel; and thus Quakerism has produced the species called "White Quakerism." The original Quakers forbid the use of gaudy colours; the "White Quakers" forbid any colour at all, save that which is natural. They do not dye their cloths or colour their leather.

Heresies, like schisms, may be primary, secondary, tertiary, &c.

Quakerism would be a primary heresy. White Quakerism, a secondary heresy, *i. e.*, a heresy from a heresy.

As the church spreads its principles and extends its connexion through the labours of missionaries, so also do schismatical and heretical bodies.

The views above laid down will lead us to some considerations with respect to the Church of Rome not unimportant.

Many of the doctrines of the Church of Rome are heretical in their character; such we would pronounce the doctrine of purgatory, &c., to be. We learn, however, from the Old Testament, than when false doctrines run to idolatry, even though the Deity himself be not expressly renounced or denied, they constitute apostasy from God. On this

principle the Church of Rome is apostate. Its heretical doctrines eventuate in apostasy. Italy, or at least Rome, is its proper locality. Yet, even there it is heretical and apostate; separation from it, even there, does not constitute schism, because God himself commands it. It cannot be said, however, that in Italy the Church of Rome is *schismatical*, nor can it be said that the Church of Spain or the Church of France, when it embraces the doctrines and admits the authority of Rome, is schismatical, although by the forbidden connexion, each of these churches becomes guilty of heretical apostasy.

But when the Church of Rome establishes a branch in the territory of another church—for example, in Ireland or in England—whereby it not merely teaches its heretical doctrines, but seduces the flock from their lawful pastors, that branch is at once schismatical, heretical, and apostate.

Such is the character of the Church of Rome in Ireland; it breaks the unity of the church, while it teaches apostasy from Christ.

When, in the ordinance of Providence, the United Church of England and Ireland plants the churches, and spreads Gospel truth in the British colonies; and when then the Church of Rome sends her missionaries there “into other men’s line of things,” to spread her antichristian principles, she acts in a manner that is indicative of a schismatical, an heretical, and an apostate spirit.

Heresy, again, instead of existing in a separated form, may be resident within the church itself; nay, even apostasy may lurk within it, the church.

A member of the church contaminated with the Arian heresy, may be pronounced a heretic, although he still continue to be connected with the church. One similarly circumstanced, who had imbibed the errors of Popery, or, according to the nomenclature of the Puseyites, embraced “the whole cycle of Roman doctrine,” would be a latent apostate.

Since the word schism implies separation, there can scarcely be a schismatic within the church; yet there cannot be a doubt but that one of its members might be influenced by a schismatical spirit. The manifestation of such a spirit is the evidence of a disposition to break away from the church and its authorities.

So long as the heretic, the apostate, or the schismatical member continue in connexion with the church, and, therefore, subject to its jurisdiction, he may be considered as occupying a position which, as far as it respects himself, may be regarded as rather more hopeful than that of open secession would be. It may be thought a question, however, whether it is not one more hostile to the church’s interest. The physicians are agreed that there is less of danger connected with the breaking out of inflammation to the surface, than in the ravages that it makes upon the constitution by its indwelling within the system; and the analogy would appear to hold good in reference to the doctrinal pravity to which such a body as the church is in its members liable.

Perhaps none will refuse to admit that, had Messrs. Newman, Oakley, Ward, and the rest separated from the church years ago, it would have been far less detrimental to her interests than their hypocritical adhesion has proved ; and the justice of this opinion will lead to the conclusion that we have some reason to deplore the tenacity with which Dr. Pusey and his friends still continue to adhere to the church.

However, the correction of intrinsic heresy, apostasy, and disorder, belongs to the bishops ; and discipline is evidently at fault when these evils are allowed, *sub silentio*, to work their pernicious results. To public opinion it belongs, and to the gradual progress of sound scriptural sentiment, both within the church and without it, to abolish the heresy, schism, and apostasy which stand confessed in avowed separation.

I humbly presume to think, then, that the weight of the offence of which our separating brethren who maintain orthodoxy of doctrine are guilty, is irregularity. I cannot allow myself for a moment to doubt of the saving nature of the faith which animated such men as John Bunyan, Adam Clarke, and Robert Hall. The unquestionable holiness of their lives and soundness of their doctrines in essentials, with the deep acquaintance with spiritual things manifested by them, render inevitable the conclusion that they richly enjoyed the grace of God and the teachings of his Holy Spirit. This is "a great fact." Our business is not to deny it, or shut our eyes to it, because it clashes with our theories, but to receive and admit it, and to make it an ingredient in whatever reasonings we engage in.

What I said in a previous chapter appears to me to put it beyond any manner of doubt, that one of the characteristics of the church of Christ is, that it continues in "the Apostles' fellowship." But it seems evident, while, ordinarily, union with the church was the rule, and separation from it the evidence of a sensual spirit, (see Jude, ver. 19.) that, in a few instances, such separation was recognised as not incapable of being connected with spiritual blessings. For example : in that very remarkable passage which is put on record by two of the evangelists, (Mark ix. 38 ; Luke ix. 49,) "John answered him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and we forbade him, because he followeth not with us ; but Jesus said, Forbid him not, for there is no man which can do a miracle in my name that can lightly speak evil of me, for he that is not against us is on our part ;" we find broadly and distinctly stated, first—the case of an individual who, in a state of separation from the apostolic body, was casting out devils in the name of Jesus. We find the apostles indignant at the irregularity, and interposing to prevent it. We then find them corrected by the Lord himself—"Forbid him not ;" render him no opposition ; let him go on with his good work." And not merely does he prescribe that he should not be interrupted, but in a manner the most lucid, he declares the reason why—"for no man can do a miracle in my name, and lightly speak of evil of me ; for he that is not against us, is on our part."

Elsewhere he had said, "He that is not with me is against me." (Matt. xii. 30.) The apparent discrepancy between the two passages is reconciled by considering the purport of each.

In the former case, the party spoken of was right in point of principle. "He was casting out devils in the name of Jesus." He was irregular, but merely in a point of form; "he followed not with them;" therefore was he, by the very Word of Truth itself, declared to be "not against them, but on their part."

In the latter case, the party spoken of was wrong in point of principle. So far from casting out devils in Jesus' name, he stood apart from the work of the Lord, and calumniated it. Of him, therefore, it was said, that he was "against Christ," because he stood apart from him on principle.

Thus, then, are we taught that separation from the Christian body in matter of order may still be consistent with union with Christ; but that separation from Christ in point of principle involves direct hostility to his person, honour, and government—it is antichristian.

Now *ubi lex non distinguit nec nos distinguere debemus*—where Christ does not pronounce anathema, neither should we. The case for union, and against division, as made manifest in the above passage, is quite strong enough without endeavouring to make more of it than the text warrants. Shall we run into a state of separation from the Christian body because we may not be damned for it? Shall we stand apart from the church of the apostles because the Head of that church may graciously overlook our irregularity? Shall our relation to that church be described by a "not against," instead of being indicated by a close, cordial, and affectionate union? Were Christ once again to sojourn amongst us, what man who calls himself a Christian would prefer coldly to stand apart from him because he might not be condemned for it, rather than to cleave with inseparable devotion to his side?

With our Master, then, I fully admit that pious dissenters are "not against Christ," and "that if they cast out devils in his name they do not speak lightly of him;" and therefore I would "not forbid them." This, however, does not alter the state of the case, which without complaining of it, I allege with respect to them, namely—that they do not "follow with" the apostles—that they are disconnected with the apostolic church. They are not indeed apostate, like the Papists; they are, however, in a state of separation, irregularity, and schism.

CHAPTER III.

OUR DIVISIONS — I. EXTRINSIC TO THE CHURCH; II. INTRINSIC. —
EXTRINSIC DIVISIONS, THEIR ORIGIN TWOFOLD.

An acquaintance with the true nature of the Church of Rome, and of the various other religious bodies which surround us, and of the relation in which our church stands to each and all of them, is calculated greatly to make plain before us the path in which it is our duty to walk.

It will have been distinctly seen that our church in her authoritative formularies, which are adopted and recognised by British law, distinctly states at once the schismatical and apostate character of the Church of Rome. If the United Church of England and Ireland teach falsely, when she says that "the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm," (Article 37;) that is to say, no jurisdiction of right—no just title to foist his clergy into the pastures of our church, and thus to create a party that is schismatical; and if she (our church) is further false in pronouncing the Church of Rome to be guilty of gross idolatry, &c., and, therefore, apostate—if, I repeat, our church is false in her protest against Rome, then may she be well pronounced in that groundless protest, uncharitably, criminally heretical. I will not say that such heresy should compel us to separate from her, for as I have more than once expressed, separation from the Apostolic Church is not the alternative which should be adopted in case of corruption in that church. But I will say that churchmen who regard their church as bearing false witness against Rome, should, without any delay, engage (and actively, too) in the work of endeavouring to produce a reform of so huge an evil. There can be no neutrality in such a case as this; no "running with the hare and holding with the hounds;" no such thing as saying, we may let the Church of Rome alone; or, with Sir Robert Peel, we may devote the money of the State to the inculcation of her doctrines, notwithstanding the protest we have entered against them. No! such a course of conduct were base, vile, and unprincipled. Let us be one thing or the other—let us be either Papists or Protestants; but let us abandon the contemptible notion of supposing that we can be both at once—that we can protest against Rome as our church does, and at the same time, with honour and principle, countenance or support Popish priests and provide for the inculcation of Popish sentiments.

The position of the Church of Rome in Ireland is clear and distinct. I had corrupted with its idolatries and its accumulated heresies,

amounting in the aggregate to a virtual apostasy from the faith of Christ, the ancient Irish Church planted by St. Patrick. By the good hand of our God upon us, we did, at the era of the Reformation, cast off the conglomeration of Roman error with which we had become burdened, and the yoke of Roman supremacy beneath which we had bent our necks. The bishops, priests, and deacons of the Irish Church, I may say, unanimously renounced the Pope. What then? Why, then, contrary to the express principle of Scripture, the Bishop of Rome intruded into "other men's line of things." He planted in this country, Ireland, already occupied by its ancient church, a new church—a post-reformational body. He introduced into Ireland a new succession of prelates, the first of which was not St. Patrick, but Robert Wainchob, or Wauchob, a blind Scotchman, who derived his mission, not from Celestine, in the fifth century, but from Pope Pius IV., in the 16th. Indeed, this new succession of Roman bishops did not become planted in all the Irish sees till full 150 years after the Reformation. The Church of Rome, the other day, planted a branch of itself in New Zealand, and another in India, in the British settlements. It will not be pretended, even by the Papists themselves, that their Indian Church—that their New Zealand Church, are not modern churches. The Roman Catholic Church in Ireland antedates them but by a very few years. We call for the overthrow of this mushroom, schismatical, and apostate church—we call upon the authorities of our country to root it up and expel it from the land, not by the fires of persecution, but by the adequate maintenance and promulgation of the truth. The thing demands scorn, not more by its heterodox character than by the pitiable intellectual position to which it has been reduced. Its priests are silenced. They have helplessly retreated from the field of argument. While we pour out denunciations upon the fore-doomed Apostasy—while we hold it up to the execration of mankind—while we fasten upon it by "demonstrations strong as Holy Writ," the charge of being that very body of Antichrist against which the thunders of Heaven are threatened, the sole answer is a reiteration of the cuckoo cry, "We are seven millions."

Now, if the British Minister stood up in parliament, and on the ground of the antichristian character of the Church of Rome, not merely refused all countenance to that church, but announced the withdrawal of state support from every one of its institutions, how could he be met? Is it not abstract justice—is it not perfectly reasonable and fair, that a great Christian state, such as the United Kingdom is, should absolutely refuse to teach antichristian error and falsehood? Could the nation be charged with injustice for so doing? Does it involve in the very slightest degree the crime of oppression? Certainly not. Nay, if the minister went further—If he said, "it is impossible that the general prosperity can be secured, save in the general prevalence of Christian principle; and Christian principle cannot generally prevail, save through the instrumentality of Christian legislation; and legislation cannot be Christian, unless the Legislature be so too; and,

therefore, in order to the general prosperity, happiness, and peace, temporally speaking, to say nothing of the eternal welfare of the people, the exclusion of Roman Catholics from parliament is imperatively demanded ;" how could he be answered ? In one single way alone, by proofs in the face of Parliament of the Christian rectitude of Roman Catholic principles ; but such proof is impossible, and, therefore, an answer to a ministerial statement such as I have supposed, is impossible, likewise.

But why is not such language used by the prime minister ? Because our pitiable divisions have rendered us unable to call upon him so to speak ; because he laughs to scorn the demands of a disunited people. Now, our divisions are of two kinds,

First. *Extrinsic* ; or, obvious and open ; and
Secondly. *Intrinsic*.

First. By our extrinsic divisions, I mean the sectarianism which is the reproach of the Protestant world, let us consider its origin.

1. *I am quite sure that this evil springs in a great degree from the depravity and perverseness of human nature.* The proneness to fight and quarrel, to bicker and dispute, rather than to live together in unity, disposes men to fly away from the church on frivolous pretences.

It amazes me to see the obstinacy with which men keep their eyes closed to an undeniable fact. They rail against a national church and an established clergy ; they proclaim that these alone are the obstacles to the evangelisation of the world ; that they are ever leagued with the oppressors of mankind, and that it is patriotic and religious, too, to confederate for their destruction. Why, to what do we owe the Reformation in these islands, and, therefore, the constitutional liberties which we enjoy ? We owe them to ministers of the establishment, and we owe it to *them* because they were such. Who was that Fitzralph of Dundalk, whose noble protest against monasticism, in the fourteenth century, awakened the attention of England, sounded through France, was heard with power in the Vatican itself, and at last rendered him the victim of those monks whose antichristian character he had exposed ? He was Archbishop of Armagh ; he owed to the eminence of the station that he occupied, the public attention that he obtained, and which made his example influential to that degree, that it rendered John Wickliffe, who flourished in a subsequent generation, a great reformer. And who was John Wickliffe ? He was Vicar of Lutterworth, in Leicestershire. There he had "a local habitation and a name." The provision that he derived from the church, "the fixity of tenure" that made him resident in one district ; these it was which gave efficacy to his testimony. He did not depend for existence upon the precarious supply which flowed from the fickle fancy of a congregation of "voluntaries." It was the living which the church supplied him with, and the permanency of station which it afforded him, that

enabled him with effect to grapple with the corruptions of his time. Were not Cranmer and Latimer, Ridley and the rest of them, members of the Established Church—generally bishops and Presbyters? Were not John Knox and Wiseheart, the Scottish reformers, also clergymen of the establishment? and may not the same be said of the galaxy of great names, Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, &c. &c., to whom the Continent of Europe stands indebted for liberty? State churches bred them, and fed them, and ultimately yielded to the influence which flowed from their learning and their piety; and at the present day, from whence is a flood of light breaking forth upon Germany, but from the midst of an established church?

How comes it that the voluntary system has not at least reformed a few Popish countries? Where are the voluntary congregations in Italy, in Austria, in Belgium? Can they find no footing in Popish countries? Can they do nothing to evangelise the people there? Why, then, should we not conclude that they result simply from an abuse of that liberty which the labours of a reformed Catholic clergy have produced? They mistake the petulance which springs from human depravity, and which the mild principles of the Reformation tolerate, for a spirit of holy zeal and Christian liberty. The sole vocation of "the voluntaries," as it respects the Christian world, seems to be to quarrel with churches already reformed. I am well acquainted with the extent of their missionary labours, and the success that has attended them; but in order to the fulfilment of those labours and the obtaining of that success, was it necessary to quarrel with brethren at home? Where, however, are the missionary voluntaries issuing forth to convert the world, from Portugal, from Spain, from Italy? It may be, perhaps, advanced in reply, that it is the existence of state churches, of Popish establishments in these countries, that has spread over them the dense clouds of a darkening superstition. Precisely so; and a State establishment had done the same thing in England, in Ireland, in Denmark, and in Sweden; and in these countries that very same thing was broken to pieces by the established clergy themselves. But had these clergy acted on the voluntary principle—had they separated themselves from the State—had the powers that then were been left by them unmoved, influenced, unpersuaded—had they, in effect, been beguiled by the infatuated doctrine that the State has nothing to do with religion, it is, perhaps, a demonstrable principle,—one, at all events, of the very highest probability, that there would not at this moment be in existence a free kingdom or a Protestant people. I can conceive the superior intelligences looking down upon our earth, listening to the bickerings of "the voluntaries," and of like-minded sectarians, to the reproaches which they cast upon our liturgy and institutions. This, I can conceive, but it is impossible that I can conceive it without being forced to the conclusion, that the perception of those bickerings would be accompanied with a deep feeling of astonishment and indignation at the bickers. "O fools and blind! you cavil at the baptismal services of the church, at its funeral, visitatorial,

and confirmational services; base ingratitude! We were present at the deliberations of those holy men of God, whose wisdom and whose devotedness have conferred upon you that liberty which makes your land the envy and the admiration of the world; we were witnesses of their conduct as they were engaged in the review of those services against which you cavil; we saw them coerced by two distinct powers—the power of Christian principle on the one hand, and the power of the State on the other, while they walked on a narrow ledge, precipitous on either side, into which if they stumbled, darkness, and death, and bondage, would have been the inheritance of their country. They were aware that the main feeling which governed the ruler was, a desire to make the reformed religion subservient to the maintenance of the people in a superstitious obedience. Providentially involved in a quarrel with the Pope, he had professed the reformed principle, but dreading the progress of popular liberty, he shrunk from its development. While he desired deliverance from Papal tyranny, he cleaved with unyielding tenacity to the royal prerogative. While he hated Popery, he feared the Reformation. God had simultaneously poured out his grace upon the heads of the church. They were for the boldest Protestantism. They would have shrunk from no decisiveness in point of language; they would have coveted a tone more clear, a line more distinctly marked in many of their services. They had to maintain a long and a severe contest, in order to exclude absolute Popery, and to keep their principle unadulterated. They were menaced with the withdrawal of the royal countenance. The enmity of princes in Italy, in Spain, and elsewhere, had there quenched the light of the Reformation. These holy men saw their danger. They would not compromise the truth, they did not sacrifice it. But they were constrained to the adoption of a language that was capable of being misunderstood. They saw distinctly that their language was capable of an interpretation that was evangelical. They were well aware that it was capable of one, also, that was non-evangelical—but they threw themselves upon posterity. They called on posterity to judge them by their lives and by their writings, and to give them credit for retaining inviolate the deposit of truth, even though their enemies might say that they had made shipwreck of it. Had they not acted thus, with a zeal that was tempered with wisdom and prudence, they would have disgusted their princes, and you that now disparage their labours, instead of rejoicing in a liberty that you abuse, would be the bondslaves of a tyranny as oppressive as that which blights and withers the human mind in other lands.”

Yes, unquestionably there is much of folly, much of perverseness, much of a froward, wilful, and heedless spirit at the bottom of the divisions of the Protestant world. Those causes of division, however, we must leave. To remove them is not ours. We may mourn their consequences; but we do not rest under their responsibility. Are there, however, no causes of secession save this, that some professors of Christianity are “sensual, not having the Spirit?” Is the church

itself in no respect to blame? Churchmen cannot set right that obliquity of view—that perverseness of spirit—that blindness to benefits received and enjoyed, which hurries men into separation from the church; but is there nothing that they can do? Are there no evils in the church to be corrected? is there no impropriety, defect, or imperfection which their united testimony may bring under the general attention, and which their loud appeal may cause to be reformed? Though there may not be *causes* for separation, is there not something that may be considered as its *palliative* for the removal of which it is our duty to struggle? We seek for the eradication of Popery; may not the search be connected with a necessity for the improvement of our own church? Before we seek to take the mote out of our brother's eye, is there no beam that we should cast out of our own? Our church is gloriously orthodox in doctrine and apostolic in position—granted, thank God for it. Is it, however, as free and untrammelled as it ought to be? Though faultless in itself, is there nothing in its circumstances to be complained of—nothing that may engender dissent, or at least afford it a plausible excuse?

I want, I confess it, to promote among churchmen energetic action. I want to root out of Ireland hell-born Popery. I want liberty for the captive, and opening of eyes for the blind—to engage all Protestants of every degree in a long pull, a strong pull, and a pull altogether for the extirpation of our master evil. But auxiliary to this work there are circumstantial objects to be attained; we must know what they are, in order that we may with one heart, and mind, and soul, devote ourselves, under God, to the task of their accomplishment.

2. *What then is there in the church itself that may be wrested into an excuse or an apology for schism?*

There can be no manner of question but that, with the perfect security of every interest concerned, and the vast advantage of the church itself, the liberty of its members might be extensively enlarged.

I can by no means give my assent to the hypothesis of the Quakers, which lays it down that there should not be a distinct order of ministers—a body of clergy—men set apart to preach the Word and minister in holy things. I am convinced that if this hypothesis were generally adopted and acted on, its natural operation would be to blot out, almost entirely the name and influence of Christianity. There is an immense disposition on the part of men in general to postpone the sacred to the secular, and were they not constantly reminded of the importance of spiritual things by those who are set apart to minister in them, worldly-mindedness would altogether possess them—infidelity would make irresistible inroads amongst all the classes—the love of pleasure would engross the whole attention of society, until at length it became brutalised and undone. Let a man be ever so deeply impressed with the importance of religious truth, and experienced in the spiritualities of religion, the wear and tear of the world, its defilements, and its anxieties, if he live in the midst of it, will

deteriorate his spirit. He will give way in little things; he will comply; he will compromise; and if he be not acted on by the influence of others, secured by circumstances from the constant afflux of those corruptions to which he is himself liable, he will gradually lapse into total indifference as to religion, if he do not become its open and avowed opponent.

The state of things amongst the Quakers themselves abundantly verifies these observations. Perhaps it would be hard to find a class of men more grasping and avaricious, more entirely devoted to the world and its enjoyments, or whose religious principles are more decidedly latitudinarian.

Distinct orders, then, of ministers, whose vocation it is to feed the flock, to be able to give to every man an answer for the hope that is in them, to silence gainsayers and maintain the truth, are essentially requisite to the well-being of society. What a condition would the world be now reduced to had the pernicious labours of Herbert, and Hobbes, and Bolingbroke, of Toland, and Tom Paine, and the rest of the infidel writers, been unanswered by the phalanx of learned divines whom the church bred up, taught, and maintained! Under this supposition, England would have seen more revolutions than ever afflicted Spain; and, instead of being the birth-place and the home of liberty, would be the licentious abode of incurable anarchy and confusion. There can be no doubt but that a ministry set apart for holy things is perhaps the very greatest blessing that society enjoys.

But on the other hand, it is unquestionably true, that a wise and gracious Providence in rich abundance occasionally confers spiritual gifts upon unordained men. The peculiar glory of the Gospel is, that it is a "dispensation of the Spirit." "It shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon *all flesh*;" (Acts ii. 17); and St. Paul gives us a whole chapter (1 Cor. xii.) on the subject of spiritual gifts. He tells us, that "no man can call Jesus Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." (3rd verse.) That "the manifestation of the Spirit is given to *every man* to profit withal." (7th verse.) That wisdom, and knowledge, and power, are his gifts, (8th, 9th, and 10th verses). That "all these doth one and the self-same Spirit work, dividing to every man severally, as he will." (11th verse.) And we know from the history of the church, that so it is.

How great was the liberty that existed in the Jewish Church, when our Lord appeared on earth! Though he did not belong to the sacerdotal tribe of the Levites, he constantly preached in the synagogues of the Jews. Our Lord has been called "a dissenter." If the term mean a separatist, he surely was nothing of the sort.

One of the Homilies concentrates a number of texts which make it quite plain, that both Christ and his apostles, although they loudly denounced the religious abuses of their times, preached and taught in the established places of worship.

In the Acts it is mentioned, how that Peter and John went up to the temple at the hour of prayer. (Acts iii.) And St. Paul praying in the temple at Jerusalem,

was wrapped in the spirit, and did see Jesus speaking unto him. (Acts xii.) And as in all convenient places, prayer may be used of the godly, privately ; so it is most certain, that the church or temple is the due and appointed place for common and public prayer. Now, that it is likewise the place of thanksgiving unto the Lord, for his innumerable and unspeakable benefits bestowed upon us, appeareth notably at the latter end of the Gospel of St. Luke, and the beginning of the story of the Acts, where it is written, that the apostles and disciples, after the ascension of the Lord, continued with one accord daily *in the temple*, always praising and blessing God. (Luke xxiv., Acts ii.)

In the story of the Acts of the Apostles, we read that Paul and Barnabas preached the word of God *in the temple of the Jews*, at Salamis. And when they came to Antioch, they entered on the Sabbath-day into the *synagogue*, or church, and sat down. And after the lesson, or reading of the law and the prophets, the ruler of the temple sent unto them, saying, "Ye men, and brethren, if any of you have any exhortation to make unto the people, say it ;" and so Paul, standing up and making silence with his hand, said—"Ye men that be Israelites, and ye that fear God, give ear, &c." Acts xiii. preaching to them a sermon out of the Scriptures, as there at large appeareth. And in the same story of the Acts, the 17th chap. is testified, how Paul preached Christ out of the Scriptures at Thessalonica. And in the 15th chap., James the apostle, in that holy council and assembly of his fellow apostles, saith—"Moses of old time, hath in every city certain that preacheth him in the *synagogues* or temples, where he is read every Sabbath-day." (Acts xv.) By these places, ye may see the usage of reading the Scriptures of the Old Testament among the Jews, in their *synagogues*, every Sabbath-day, and sermons usually made upon the same. How much more then is it convenient, that the Scriptures of God, and specially the Gospel of our Saviour Christ, should be read and expounded to us, that be Christians, in our churches, specially our Saviour Christ, and his apostles, allowing this most godly and necessary usage, and by their examples, conforming to the same !

It is written in the stories of the Gospels, in divers places, that Jesus went round about all Galilee, teaching *in their synagogues* and preaching the Gospel of the kingdom.—Matt. iv., Mark i., Luke iv., Matt. xiii. xx., Mark vi., Luke xiii., in which places in his great diligence, in continual preaching and teaching of the people, is most evidently set forth.

In Luke, ye read how Jesus, according to his accustomed use, came *in the temple*, and how the book of Isaiah the prophet was delivered him, (Luke iv.) ; how he read a text therein, and made a sermon upon the same.

And in the 19th, as expressed, how he taught *daily in the temple*. (Luke xix.) And it is thus written in the 8th of John, "Jesus came again early in the morning *into the temple*, and all the people came unto him, and he sat down and taught them." (John viii.) And in the 18th of John, our Saviour testifieth before Pilate, that he spake openly unto the world, and that *he always taught in the synagogue, and in the temple*, whither all the Jews resorted, and that secretly he spake nothing. (John xxiii.) And in St. Luke, "Jesus taught in the temple, and all the people came early in the morning unto him, that they might hear him in the temple." (Luke xxi.)

Here ye see as well the diligence of our Saviour, in teaching the word of God *in the temple* daily, and specially on the Sabbath-days, as also the readiness of the people resorting together, and that early in the morning, into the temple to hear him.

The same example of diligence in preaching the word of God *in the temple*, shall ye find in the apostles, and the people resorting unto them, (Acts the 5th;) where the apostles, although they had been whipped and scourged the day before, and by the high priest commanded that they should preach no more in the name of Jesus, yet, the day following, they entered early in the morning *into the temple*, and did not cease to teach and declare Jesus Christ. And in sundry other places of the story of the Acts, ye shall find like diligence, both in the apostles in teaching, and in the people in coming to *the temple* to hear God's word. (Acts xiii., xv. xvii.) (*Homily on the Right use of the Church.*)

It is not possible to read this testimony, by the church herself placed in our hands, without being led into reflections upon the very striking character of the liberty which we find to have existed in this primitive age. Jesus was a reformer—to the human eye, a man of low estate—a carpenter's son. To all appearance, he took upon himself the office of preaching. Stupendous as were his miracles, and vast as were the multitudes who witnessed them, they were regarded by a still greater number as, perhaps, fables—figments intended to impose upon the world. No doubt, therefore, Jesus himself was looked upon with great suspicion, and more especially by the clergy, and by the respectable ranks. Yet we find “the temple” thrown open to him; “He taught daily in the temple,” while, throughout all the synagogues of the Jews in Judea and in Galilee, not merely did he himself, but his apostles also teach! those apostles being persons of the very humblest rank, fishermen, and such like. The facts thus brought before us are extraordinary, and they imply a state of things utterly antagonistic to that which exists among ourselves.

It is an understood principle of our church that no man can preach unless he be in holy orders. Nay, as if even that qualification were not sufficient, it is still further limited. An ordained clergyman must be licensed for the fulfilment of his function by the bishop or the ordinary, that is to say, the superior ecclesiastical power who lawfully presides. I think the popular notion is, that a regularly beneficed clergyman may, without obstacle, preach in any pulpit within the church to which he may be invited by the legal occupant; and this certainly would appear to be the reason of the case. Surely the church can scarcely present itself as entitled to the respect of the community, if every one of its ministers be an object of suspicion or distrust, or be liable to be viewed as such, in every place but one? Yet, we have all heard of bishops and archbishops, too, at the present day, who claim a veto on the preaching of a man, no matter how high his character—no matter how much in the favour of his own ordinary, if he be not agreeable to themselves. If this claim spring from the mere petulance of some misplaced pedagogue, improperly transferred from grinding under-graduates to (as he supposes) the grinding of clergymen, it is a lesser evil; for, in due season, the nuisance will be removed, give place to some wise man, and the oppression of ministers thus terminate with the folly, the blindness, and the illiberality of the spiritual tyrant who originated it, and gratified the gall of bitterness which was in him by the indulgence of his evil spirit.

Should the laws of the church, however, be the cause of the peculiarity, they bring before us two alternatives, either of which is equally to be deplored. If men may be beneficed in one diocese, and at the same time unworthy of being heard in the pulpits of another, and thus render a law for their exclusion reasonable and expedient, then must the church be allowed to be in a most pitiable condition of inefficiency—the warrant of its authorities but of small value; the judg-

ment, therefore, of those authorities, in no respect to be relied on; and the clergy who serve under them, so far from being trustworthy, the proper objects of suspicion. But if, on the other hand, the licence of the ordinary in one place, possessed by ministers, lawfully connecting them with the church, involve the idea of their being faith-worthy, and deserving of being heard in general, whilst at the same time impediments are thrown in their way, the locomotion of their gifts forbidden, and they themselves, whatever be their leisure, trammelled by legal obstacles, then, certainly, it can by no means be said that the Word of God has free course through the church. The adoption of the first alternative will infer the corruption—of the second, the unjustifiable bondage of the mystical body of Christ.

There can be no doubt but that there exists on the part of many of our bishops, considerable jealousy on the score of their prerogative. They seem to think themselves entitled to govern their clergy absolutely, and to deny them the exercise of any sort of discretion whatsoever. They would appear to suppose that pulpits have been conferred upon the clergy, which they are each to hold as the mere *locum tenens* of his proper bishop, admitting none into them save those approved of by the bishop himself. The love of power is congenial to man; to overstretch it is a natural disposition. And, although after the most serious consideration of our canons ecclesiastical, I feel convinced that it was not by any means the intention of those who framed them, to invest the bishop with so absolute a power, I fully admit that those canons may be so strained as to seem to countenance it.

It is plain, however, that if it be a question whether the laws of the church do not to some extent, more than is necessary, restrict the liberty of the clergy, there can be no question at all as to the fact, that they by no means countenance the exercise of such gifts as those of preaching, praying, or prophesying by unordained men. I will not say that they forbid it either, I will not say but that wise and holy bishops might go a great deal further than is usually gone in the allowance of spiritual liberty to pious laymen, upon the ground that such conduct on their (the bishop's) part was not forbidden by the church; and that where the law did not expressly interpose to forbid a certain line of conduct, there it might not improperly be under peculiar circumstances adopted. But I repeat as aforesaid, that our ecclesiastical law does not appear to recognise lay ministrations, either in the church or out of it.

The act of uniformity refers throughout to *ministers*, and its object is to exclude from admission into the church all such *ministers* as shall not declare "unfeigned assent and consent to the use of all things contained and prescribed in the prayer-book." I was induced some time since to think that the abolition of this restriction would be a good thing; and, perhaps, were the act *now* under consideration, it might be profitably modified. I am inclined, however, upon fuller consideration of the subject, to suppose that the act may be beneficial in its operation, and that the amelioration in the working of the church,

demand by the times, is quite consistent with the permanency of that act.

The fifth of our canons is it which forbids schism. Previously to making a few remarks on it, I would submit it to my readers. It runs thus—

"Authors of schism, and maintainers of conventicles censured."

"Whoever shall separate themselves from the communion of saints, as it is approved by the apostles' rule in the Church of Ireland, and combine themselves together in a new brotherhood, (accounting the Christians who are conformable to the doctrine, government, rites, and ceremonies of the Church of Ireland to be profane and unmeet for them to join with in Christian profession,) or shall affirm and maintain that there are within this realm, other meetings, assemblies, or congregations than such as by the laws of this land are held and allowed, which may rightly challenge to themselves the name of true and lawful Churches, let him be excommunicated, and not restored until he repent, and publicly revoke his error."

It will be seen at once that this censure merely refers to self-constituted associations calling themselves "churches," "separating from the church." It does not in any degree touch upon such a body as the Church Methodists, who neither "separate from the Church of Ireland," nor "challenge to themselves the name of a true and lawful church."

Now, there cannot be the slightest doubt that mere laymen have sometimes been richly endued with the gift of prophesying. I use the word here in the sense of preaching—a sense in which it is not unfrequently employed by ecclesiastical writers. According to the theory of our church, John Bunyan was a layman, Matthew Henry, Robert Hall were laymen, according to the same theory, the Methodist preachers and Dissenting ministers now living, or who have lived since first separation from our church took place, are all, and have been, laymen. Yet, I venture to think that there is no man having a fair claim to ordinary common sense, Christian charity, or sound learning, who will presume to say that there have not been amongst these, and that there may not still be found amongst them men of distinguished gifts, great piety, and Christian worth. I do not want to stand up as the advocate of their separation, nor even as its apologist. To their own Master they have stood, or will stand—they have fallen, or will fall. I mention the fact merely to show, that distinguished gifts of a ministerial character, and such as in our church ministers alone are allowed to exercise, may be found in laymen. And if they may exist and be found in laymen, can we suppose but that, if our church were ordered as it might be, a door for their exercise by lay members of the church, might not be thrown open so as that these gifts might be exercised without leaving the church?

There would seem to be on the part of our bishops a morbid apprehension of danger to the church—of inroads on the faith of its members—of undue excitement amongst them. They would seem to sup-

pose their function fulfilled, if they have succeeded in securing quietude and stillness. Under their regime that description of the church bestowed upon it by its Lord—"terrible as an army with banners," has no existence in nature. It appears before the world as a passive, stand-still, unprogressive body.

I feel convinced that it never was intended that the church should be thus. The Holy Spirit does not confer gifts without designing a legitimate place for their employment.

If I were asked where that place is, I would take the inquirer to the Wesleyan Methodists for an answer. Our duty is "to follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth." (Rev. xiv. 4.) If the Spirit of God abide within a sect, we should inquire what brings him there; we should seek to discover the lesson which his presence there would teach us, and we may feel tolerably sure that when the church has discovered that lesson and applied it, the irregular body will have fulfilled its vocation, and having done so, may soon be expected to take its departure from the scene.

Look, then, at the Wesleyan Methodist body; how exactly does it by its practice confirm the legitimacy of the ecclesiastical system of the church! The Wesleyans have their primate—the president of the conference for the time being; their bishops—the superintendents of districts; their presbyters—the stated preachers of districts, and these all passed through a probation analogous to our diaconate. I repeat, the Wesleyans have a most strictly-defined system of ecclesiastical officers, if I may venture to call them so, precisely analogous to our own; but at the same time they open a door of utterance for every individual in their body whose piety and whose gifts have been approved. Their local preachers are mere laymen—farmers, tradesmen, gentlemen, and in some districts, operatives; and these local preachers, if their gifts be suitable, do not merely preach in private houses, but are occasionally admitted into the most distinguished pulpits, and have in some cases been men of remarkable eloquence and power.

One of the most popular preachers in Yorkshire, when I was resident there, was Mr. William Dawson, a respectable farmer—a local preacher among the Methodists. He never assumed the title "Reverend," or gave up his original occupation. Yet, while he handled the plough, or attended to the markets on week-days, he would on Sundays attract crowds to the largest preaching houses, on whose affections, as I have been told, he wrought by a thrilling and a powerful oratory. I have often been struck in passing through Leeds by seeing immense placards announcing the charity sermons of the Wesleyan body, or their annual anniversary sermons, as about to be preached by what perhaps we should designate a very heterogeneous list of preachers; for example, the Rev. Dr. Newton, Mr. William Dawson; the Rev. Dr. Bunting, Captain Philips; the Rev. Mr. Alder, Edward Brooke, Esq. Such a miscellany of "divines,"—civil, military, and reverend, could not but appear strange to one whose habits of thinking had been formed in Ireland. And yet, if it be reflected on, it pre-

sents nothing inconsistent with the ecclesiastical idea which Scripture may convey.

The Spirit of God in the heart of believers is represented to be "a well of water springing up into eternal life," (John iv. 14,) and "rivers of living water flow," as it is declared, from "him that believeth on Christ;" (John vii. 37;) to guide those streams, to give them a beneficial direction, to render them as much as possible fertilising, would seem to be the part of the church, and this is the wisdom which is acted on by the separating brethren alluded to. The church, however, instead of guiding, would stop the outgoings of the Spirit—would check their flow; and this being the case, is it any wonder that they cut out channels for themselves, which, though sometimes connected with fruitful results, are always irregular, and not unfrequently detrimental to the interests of the body which might have controlled them at her will.

Now, suppose the Act of Uniformity to be allowed to remain intact—suppose every clergyman or beneficed man still constrained by that act to testify his consent and agreement with the Book of Common Prayer, (all the Methodists, I believe, do this,)—suppose our canons, ecclesiastical articles, homilies, liturgy, and so forth, to remain as they are; and suppose at the same time our bishops to admit into distinct and avowed connexion with the church the Church Methodists of Ireland—I grant that the connexion of this highly-respectable body with the church has never been cut, rent, dissociated; nevertheless, there is no denying that they are coldly regarded; they are rather tolerated than cordially embraced; but let the opposite conduct be pursued; let them be really and confessedly identified with the church as one with it; their ministers admitted as lay-helpers; and when their gifts would warrant it, their services in our pulpits allowed—let this be done, and the very fountain-head of dissent and disunion would be dried up. I would say that, under the supposition which I have made, it were wisdom to trammel as little as possible the liberty that they at present enjoy; the operation of the society as it is, is unquestionably for good; their educational labours are abundant, their means of grace numerous. Let their various meetings be quite undisturbed. Let them still derive their support from the voluntary contributions of the people; but legitimatise their connexion by a distinct and cordial recognition. Let their society constitute an open door for the admission of the lay-help that may be found in the church. That help will soon become to be of a very superior class; men of education will be found coming forward to give their services, nor will the humbler classes fail to receive recognition when their qualifications would entitle them to it. The result will be, that the church, thus providing a place of activity and of distinction for each of her gifted children, and gradually, as occasion shall suggest, drafting them into a higher rank, will attract and identify with herself, those who are now driven into separation—into ranks which, if not absolutely hostile, are to a certain extent antagonistic. Thus would that "Christian union"

be legitimately produced of which we hear so much at the present day, and with respect to which I cannot but fear, that it has been pursued in a manner somewhat inconsistent with the principles of churchmen.

I certainly think that when the Rev. Hugh M'Neile gave it some time ago as his opinion, that what was demanded for Christian unity was the Repeal of the Act of Uniformity, he struck the key-note of the subject. For the spirit of his observation was this, that, so far as the church was at all responsible for disunion, her responsibility grew out of repelling laws, which drove men into separation because of differences on non-essentials, and that by the removal of those repelling influences a door for access would be opened to all who held "the head." In other words, the *principle* of Mr. M'Neile implied, that the remedy for disunion (so far as it admitted of remedy by human appliances) lay with the church herself, and this certainly is a sound principle. We might rest easy about division, if it had no excuse but human perverseness. When, however, we allow bonds to be imposed for which we do not find warrant in Scripture, when we close avenues of approach that should always have been left open, we afford a certain justification to the evil which lends it strength and countenance, and procures for it the disastrous popularity by which it exists and flourishes. Hence, I was very much taken with Mr. M'Neile's proposition, rather from the principle which, as I have explained, it involves, than from any acquaintance with the Act of Uniformity, which, truth to say, I had at the time never read.

The study of the Act since, although it has not diminished the approval with which I view the *principle* of our distinguished brother, has modified my feelings on the subject. The Act, I admit, demands full agreement on the part of ministers with the prayer-book, and would thus shut out from admission to the ministerial office those who might dissent even on points of inferior importance. But if it exclude these, much more does it the vitally heterodox, and to its operation we are, perhaps, indebted for the absence from the church of a motley gathering of dangerous heretics—Socinians of every shade, that is to say, Infidels in fact—Papists of every kind, that is to say, idolaters. But if once the barrier were broken in upon, and subscription ceased to be demanded, there can scarcely be a doubt but that in no very long time the church would be as a cage of unclean birds. It has long been our privilege to boast that, whatever heterodoxy might perjurally make its way to the pulpit, evangelical truth sounded forth, at least, from the reading desk. I fear that it were to be apprehended, that if the Act of Uniformity were repealed, neither reading desk nor pulpit would speak the truth, and, consequently I am forced to the conclusion, that the repeal of the act would be a most perilous experiment.

This does not, however, alter the truth, nor abate the wisdom of the principle from which Mr. M'Neile's proposition sprang, namely, that Christian union was to be sought in a modification of the conduct of

the church, rather than through any alteration that was to be hoped for in the feelings or the conduct of dissenters.

We have arrived at a crisis in the history of the church, and one or other of two courses would seem inevitable.

The church must either be supplanted by a Popish establishment, or else be so invigorated as that it may bid defiance to its enemies. Those divisions which are the reproach of the Protestant world, have resulted in a weakness apparently inconsistent with the prevalence of truth and the rights of Christian liberty; and if we would not surrender both, we must meet the crisis with an alternative that may avert the dangers which are threatening us. There is a strong feeling in the Christian mind that this is so. From this feeling has resulted the great moral problem of the day—how best Christian unity may be secured. Hence, the “Evangelical Alliance”—an association, or a provisional association of “various denominations” of Protestants holding doctrines essentially orthodox. I am deeply concerned to say, that I have not seen much evidence in the proceedings of this body, or provisional body, of a state of mind likely to arrive at sound conclusions.*

Dissenters have all separated from the church. Were their inquiry, “How may we be reunited to it again?” their proceedings would be very hopeful. Since this is not the case, the duty of considering the causes of division seems thrown upon churchmen themselves. My feeling on the subject of those causes I have in this chapter expressed. We cannot remove the perverseness of fallen human nature; let us see whether we may not do away with the bonds that confine the church. Let our laity have their privileges. Let Christian men have a field for the exercise of their gifts, and though this may not reconcile to the church existing separatists, it will dry up the source that constantly recruits their diminishing numbers, and in one or two generations, he that stands disunited from the church will bear the character of a factious, an unreasonable, and a causeless schismatic. For the production of this end, there are alone required such bishops as are really conformed to the spirit of the church.

But if the wishes of Christian people be not made influential in high places, how can we expect such prelates as the times demand? Governments are but the creatures of circumstances. They are the servants of the community. A state of things has been brought about in which, not a rule of right, but the expression of a potent public will, is paramount. If we tamely allow Papists and Infidels to usurp the public voice, to persuade the government that they are “the people,” to establish the idea that the church is a body generally odious, is not the conclusion inevitable, that it will be sacrificed to the love of place and power? Ministers will not risk their popularity to defend a

* Since I wrote this in the First Edition, the society in question has been formed, but I cannot see my way, as I should much desire to do, to alter my language on the subject.

body that is weak—to support that which, however it may boast of having truth on its side, stands forth confessedly as without a party in the State, or a party calculated to command attention. But, on the other hand, let the friends of the church, the lovers of truth, the asserters of liberty, make up by the energy of their proceedings whatever deficiency may seem to derive from the paucity of their numbers; let them press upon the attention of the government, however reluctant it may be to hear, those views which they have been compelled by truth to declare in favour of, and the result will soon be seen in the renovation of the church, and the adoption of such improvements in its working as shall silence every gainsayer, and strike to the heart of the enemy and the avenger, hopeless despair.

There are two truths which I think incontrovertible. The first is, that the church is one—"I believe in one Catholic and Apostolic Church." The second is, that the Spirit of God has occasionally manifested his presence in separating bodies. I am constrained to the belief of the first of these truths as a churchman; of the second, as a Christian. The truths are to a certain extent paradoxical. They seem in some sort contrary the one to the other. I am disposed, however, to imagine that a just consideration of the subject will lead to the conclusion that this is not the case. God has a purpose to serve upon his church. It has "brought forth fruit;" it is to be "purged, that it may bring forth more." (John xv. 2.) Constituted as man is—weak, frail, depraved—he is liable to evil in every direction. His very privileges become to him a spring of bitterness. The possession of due order is an advantage; regularity of position is highly to be esteemed; it is no small matter to feel one's-self an ingrafted member of a body which Christ himself established, whose antiquity is like that of mountains, whose stability is warranted by the promise of the Almighty. But high as these privileges are, they are but subservient to a privilege superior to them all—that, namely, of fellowship through the Spirit with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ. The very end for which the church was ordained, was to facilitate, promote, continue union and communion between the Christian and his God. But these privileges are necessarily also connected with advantages of a temporal character, and they are capable of being highly appreciated and esteemed, not merely for the end which they are intended to subserve, but for themselves. "I belong to the true church. I am a favoured member of the very body of Christ. I belong to the community that has supplied to the world its heroes, its legislators, its reformers, its wise and great men! I am no heretic. I am no schismatic, but a spiritual stone in the very temple of the Lord."

This sort of feeling, which leads a man to conceive that he is invested with a species of holiness from his mere position; that he is, as it were, a consecrated being, because of his connexion with the church, which leads him to value the church rather for itself than for the purpose which it is subservient to; to esteem it because of what is

human in it, rather than from its divine object, would seem to be particularly abhorrent to the Almighty. Condemning his ancient church, as well for grosser evils which were found in it as for spiritual pride, God speaks thus in the 65th chapter of Isaiah. "I am sought of them which asked not for me. I am found of them that sought me not. I said, Behold me! behold me! unto a nation that was not called by my name. I have spread out my hands all the day unto a rebellious people . . . which say, Stand by thyself, come not near me, for I am holier than thou. These are a smoke in my nose, a fire that burneth all the day." (verses 1—5.) In the last verse there is expressed the loathing with which the Most High regards spiritual pride, and there is suggested to us in the first verse, that when spiritual privileges are neglected by those who are called "by the name" of God—the members of his church, they will be offered to those who do not belong to it at all. *Granting that the language employed may be primarily applicable to the rejection of the Jews and the calling of the Gentiles, it exhibits to us a characteristic of the mind of God, which would naturally operate in an analogous way, should the church under the Christian dispensation go wrong, as the Jewish Church did. The following passage would seem to bear in the same direction:—"I will take away from the midst of them that rejoice in thy pride, and thou shalt no more be haughty because of my holy mountain." (Zeph. iii. 11.) Nothing is more obvious in ultra-churchmen, for example, than the quality here denounced—Tractarians, and Romanisers of all descriptions, are "haughty because of God's holy mountain." They are insufferably arrogant, because they are undeniably Catholic. Now, the objectionable state of mind that is so conspicuous in these individuals, is a specimen of a moral evil, which, under various modifications of kind and degree, has been a sort of distemper in the church; and it engenders various other practical evils with which it would at first sight appear to have little connexion.

I imagine that when the Spirit of God has been vouchsafed to separatists, the object has been to pluck up root and branch from the church, the evil and its consequences, both of which I have spoken of. For example:—

1. The Wesleyans would appear to have been raised up to teach us that it is the duty of the church to multiply her means of usefulness; to devote herself with all her power to the conversion of souls; and the lesson is accompanied with the important appendix, that if this great duty be neglected by the church, God will, to the disgrace of the church, raise up others to perform it.

2. The Independents would appear to have been raised up to teach us that there are evils connected with the union of Church and State; and to give us to understand that if these evils be not removed, it were better that the church, though destitute of the provision which the State secures, should enjoy the liberty which the State denies.

3. From the latter body, as well as from the Free Church in Scotland, we should be impressed with the idea that patronage has its

abuses, and that the right of institution which belongs to the ordinary, should not be swamped by the right of presentation which belongs to the patron. Thus may the church learn a lesson from every separating community. When that lesson is learned and applied, the occasion which originated the separation will have vanished,—with it the separation itself will disappear, or, if it continue, be so grossly unjustifiable in its nature, so palpably factious in its character, that, deprived of the countenance of all the good, and thus rendered equally weak and contemptible, it will neither excite apprehension in the church, nor create hope in her adversaries.

CHAPTER IV.

DIVISIONS EXTRINSIC TO THE CHURCH, GROW OUT OF WANT
OF LIBERTY AND POWER IN IT.

The church of our day is not a mighty thing; it is not a powerful thing; it is overdone with gentility; it has become a drawing-room article. Christ preached on the mountains and on the hills; on the river's side, and by the sea shore. He sowed the seed beside all waters; so did St. Paul, St. Peter, St. Philip, and the apostles generally. Would clergymen be lowered by those exercises of zeal which conferred honour on their betters? But the maxim of the church at the present day would exclude, though it were warranted to think they might convert the realm, all such exertions as these.

Look at the picture of the Spanish Friar holding forth in a highway to a gathering of excited peasants. This is a modern scene. If we do not from a spirit of obedience follow a good example when it is set us by Christ, let shame drive us when we see that even Antichrist does not neglect it. Yet Antichrist has his drawing-rooms, too, and none will complain that *he* is not "high church" enough.

Did not Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, and the rest of them, hold forth at Paul's cross? and does not even the slightest acquaintance with "Fox's Book of Martyrs" clearly prove, that open air preaching was a prevalent custom previously to the era of the Reformation. But now, forsooth, this would not be *genteel*! It were improper that we should occupy ourselves in such rough work; our slate-coloured kids, our jaunty air, our fashionable manners, our conformity with the world, bespeak on our part a spirit altogether antagonistic to a mode of proceeding that would indicate that we were in earnest on the subject of religion. Indeed, at this day, gentlemen are not in earnest about anything. That were vulgarity.

* "The people sat down to eat and to drink, and rose up to play." (Exod. xxxii. 6.) This single text concentrates in itself a whole volume

of moral philosophy. It marks a profound acquaintance with the human character. If developed in its length and in its breadth, it would be found to measure the utmost outstretching of this march-of-intellect age—the nineteenth century.

"The people sat down to eat and to drink, and rose up to play." The prophet in the preceding verses tells us that they had cast off their religious principles. They made a golden calf; they fell down before it and worshipped it, and said, "These are our gods which brought us out of the land of Egypt;" and having told us that they had abandoned their religious principles—that they had ceased to be in earnest on the subject of religion, he then informs us how they spent their time: "They sat down to eat and to drink, and rose up to play." Here is a description of their *whole* conduct. The only subject that seriously occupied their attention was "eating and drinking." When they sat down it was to "eat and drink," either actually or prospectively. The object of their labours was, not the fulfilment of their duty to God, not to acquire the ability to give to him that needed, (Ephes. iv. 28,) not to provide things honest in the sight of all men, (Roms. xii. 17,) but that they might be able "to eat and to drink," and that as luxuriously as possible. They did not sit down to listen to God's Word, nor to occupy themselves with such considerations as he had prescribed. But they sat down to enjoy themselves, to pamper the flesh, to gratify the appetite, "to eat and to drink," and they "rose up to play:"—

My wife will dance, and I will sing,
And so merrily pass the day,
For I hold it ever the wisest thing
To drive dull care away!

The words of this popular verse, which, with variations, is identically the sentiment of the age, describe with precision the spirit of the worshippers of the golden calf. "They rose up to play."

Anything but "play" was odious to them; a serious discourse, a solid treatise, a thoughtful book, a sober demeanour, was humdrum and methodistical. It was calculated to remind them of responsibilities that they were determined to shake off. Living without God and without hope, their anxiety was to banish from their minds anything that might force them to the painful recollection, that by apostasy from the one, they had renounced the other. "They rose up to play." Their sole thought was pastime. The books that they read were for pastime. The authors who wrote them designed them for no higher purpose than pastime. They shocked probability, they outraged common sense, they blasphemed religion, they abused and ridiculed its ministers,—no matter for that, they were excellent—pastime. What more was required for a people who did nought else than sit down "to eat and to drink, and rise up to play?"

Have we not here the very spirit of our times? Talk of religion, indeed! Talk of Protestantism or Popery, or the necessity for a Protestant Association, or of maintaining those principles which wise men

the other day laid down their lives rather than surrender. Talk of such things as these to a gentleman with a white ribbon in his button-hole, and a long wand in his hand; a brigade of fiddlers playing before him, while men and women bawl, and he looks at you with a feeling of point-blank amazement, and a face which says, as distinctly as though it were pronounced in so many words, "Bless your simplicity! all we think of is *diversion*!" All the *great* authors of the day have one sole object—*diversion*. The man who plays the fool most outrageously, who without any scruple utters the rankest nonsense, or manifests the most extravagant spirit of buffoonery, provided only he succeed in diverting a pleasure-loving age, is honoured, fêted, crowned with laurel, pronounced a consummate genius, and dies a millionaire. Were Joseph Mede, the profoundest of divines and the wisest of men, restored to life; were Richard Cecil, a brilliant genius and a noble character; were Thomas Scott, whose labours were without parallel, and whose fine common sense outweighed all the acquisitions of scholarship; were these, or such like worthies, restored to life, they would find their occupation gone. Could they prevail on themselves to write books cram full of oaths, obscenity, and nonsense—otherwise to drag their gowns through the mire; and having done this, to stand on their heads in the midst of a crowd, knocking their heels together, to the tune of—

The days we went a-gipsying, a long time ago,

and then exhibit a hatful of coppers as the reward of their *diverting* vagabondism, they might expect a rich living for their pains, and, perhaps, at last to don a mitre, the gift of one of the military partners in the ancient firm of Church and State. Aye, and not only so, but receive the gift with the full applause of those very Papists, who, if a Croly or a Stowell were promoted by the government, would make the welkin ring with their indignant reclamations. And why is this? Why, because the golden calf of Popery is set up for adoration, and the people consistently devote themselves alone to luxury and pleasure. "They sit down to eat and to drink, and they rise up to play." They laugh to scorn the poor ninnyhammer of a man who wears a thin surtout for the sake of a principle; who goes supperless to bed because of a principle. Principle forsooth! The only sound principle at the present day is, the *principal* which bears *interest*; and he is a "wise man" who secures that, though his immortal soul be the purchase-money. Is it not quite natural that this should be the sentiment of an age too truly assimilated to the idolatrous apostates, of whom nought could be said but that "they sat down to eat and to drink, and rose up to play?"

How admirable is the description given, further on in the same chapter, of the coming of Moses upon these sporting apostates. "And Moses turned and went down from the mount, and the two tables of the testimony were in his hand; the tables were written on both their sides; on the one side and on the other were they written. And the

tables were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God graven upon the tables. And when Joshua heard the noise of the people as they shouted, he said unto Moses there is a noise of war in the camp. And he said, it is not the voice of them that shout for mastery, neither is it the voice of them that cry for being overcome, but the noise of them that sing do I hear. And it came to pass as soon as he came nigh unto the camp, that he saw the calf and the dancing." (Exod. xxxii. 15—19.)

Surpassing is the power with which the Bible plumbs the depths of the human heart! beyond all compare the terse brevity with which it brings, rushing into the soul, a flood of light from every quarter! Throw the narrative in the seventeenth and eighteenth verses into the form of a dialogue. Thus—

JOSHUA.—There is a noise of war in the camp.

MOSES.—It is not the voice of them that shout for the mastery, neither is it the voice of them that cry for being overcome, but the noise of them that sing, which I hear.

What a world of irony is here quietly conveyed! A modern pen-and-ink sketcher, would dilate the thing by telling us, that the young man, Joshua, with a simple and inquiring look, suggested that the people were engaged in the most weighty and important of all occupations, warring in defence of their lives and those of their children; that Moses, replying, shook his head, and declaring it was nothing of the sort, said, that the people having disgraced themselves in point of principle, were playing the fool in point of fact; "They are neither shouting for victory nor deploring defeat. They have not the grace, either seriously to pursue good, or to regret the existence of evil. They are diverting themselves. Having arisen from eating and drinking, they are very busy at play." And such, I repeat it again, is the character of the faithless, degenerate, ungrateful, and apostate age in which we live. Having forfeited the favour of Heaven—having abandoned our principles—having surrendered the palladium of our freedom, our greatness, and our prosperity—having secured for our children an entail of constitutional and religious bondage, and being upon the very eve of some imperial misfortune, some series of national disaster, the universal people are engaged in—*diversion*. "They sit down to eat and drink, and they rise to play." They laugh to scorn the men that would remind them that there are religious duties—that there are sacred responsibilities—that there has been criminal backsliding, and that already the heavy hand of an angry Providence is upon us. The Legislature tramples on their petitions; the crown spurns their addresses; the Papists raise the yell of scorn at their earnestness, and an infidel myriad swell the chorus of derision. The simplest moral lesson will not go down except it be conveyed amid a discharge of puns, *bons mots*, *doubles-en-tendres*, with all sorts of comical

illustrations. The idea of wielding the thunderbolt of truth is abandoned. All our great moral effects are to be accomplished by the crackers, sky-rockets, fire-wheels, and blue-lights of wit; in fact, we may soon expect to see a commentary on the Scriptures by "Punch," with appropriate illustrations by Phiz; and this making the fortune of some happy publisher. Meanwhile, frightful crimes startle the community; unexampled impoverishment crushes the people; starvation menaces Ireland. But, then, the millocrats hoard up countless millions, and study Boz.

It is well, at such a time as this, that the problem of effecting Christian union should be before the public. What we want to effect this union is, liberty for the church. The policy which was, perhaps, necessary to tie the hands of latent Papists, and save the world from the revival of a serpent that was "scotched, not killed"—the serpent Popery—that very policy is a gag in the mouth, a fetter on the leg, and chains upon the hands of the living family of God, rendering them the bond-slaves of blind successors to the Fitzralphs, the Usshers, and the George Browns; the Cranmers, the Riddleys, and the Latimers of other days. Christian liberty would nowhere be so safely exercised as in the church. It exists among the Wesleyans; and, while I would by no means join in the insults which purblind worldlings who have not the Spirit heap upon their demonstrations—their camp meetings, prayer meetings, and so forth—there is no denying that without any limit to their usefulness, or conceivable usefulness, but the reverse, they might be brought under a wholesome regulating influence. That influence exists in the church; the apostolic authority of its bishops is unquestionable; it admits of demonstration. A prescriptive reverence attaches to their function. Under their surveillance there need be but slight apprehension that liberty would degenerate into licentiousness. Vindicate the church into liberty, and soon the State will right itself, and the social evils of the community disappear.

I abhor the heresy lately promulgated in a published sermon by the Rev. Dr. Hook. The sermon is entitled the "Hem of the Garment," and a more utter, total, or complete misapprehension of the nature of the Christian religion I never read. The doctrine of the sermon is thoroughly and distinctly Popish. I read it attentively; and though I have not it by me, nevertheless, I am able to define and convey the idea which it sets forth. The sermon is on the miracle wrought on the woman who had an issue of blood, (Matt. ix. 20, &c.; Mark v. 25, &c.; Luke viii. 43,) whose faith led her to say, "If I but touch the hem of his garment, I shall be whole;" accordingly, she did so; virtue went out of him and healed her; on which Jesus said, "Be of good comfort, thy faith hath made thee whole." Now, the principle which Dr. Hook inculcates in his sermon is this, that faith led the woman to desire the touch, that the hem of the garment conveyed the healing virtue which set her constitution to rights, and that thus it is with respect to

spiritual grace exerted in the removal of sin. Faith leads the individual to look for pardon through Christ. The church in the sacraments presents "the hem of the garment," which conveys to him who lays hold on it pardon and peace, holiness and heaven—in one word, spiritual life. Pray, what is this but Popery; rank, gross, offensive; no, I beg pardon, subtle, refined, stealthy Popery? The doctor is, indeed, wise as the serpent, but not harmless as the dove; he is baleful as the serpent, too. Very clever is the way in which he would appear to exalt faith. What but faith brought the woman to the Saviour? What else created the trustfulness of her spirit? Without this faith she could not have been healed; and such is the exercise of faith, which the doctor regards as analogous to the faith which saves the soul. And well, as a latent Papist, he may; and so might any Papist; for, after all, what else is faith here but gentleman-usher, or gentlewoman-usher, to "the hem of the garment?" And what other office would it, according to the Puseyites, occupy with respect to the sacraments? It would bring men to the communion table to be "doctored" by the priest; it would be the verger, or the acolyth, to introduce the sinner to Doctor Hook, who should there manipulate him into a sanctification. In fact, according to Dr. Hook, a sort of electric shock, or influence, or virtue, would be conducted from Christ through the sacraments ("the hem of the garment") to the believer, who would thus be renewed in the spirit of his mind. Now, in opposition to all such Popery, for Popery it certainly is, the Gospel principle is of a totally different character.

Doctor Hook confounds two things essentially different in their character; the miracle which heals the body, and the grace which heals the soul. Nothing is more delusive than those reasonings which argue from things corporal to things spiritual. They constitute a favourite process of inference amongst the Papists. I have given some examples of it in chapter i., Part II. "Water purges away that which is foul and unclean from the body, *therefore*, it will drive away unclean spirits from the soul." "Fire purges out the impurities of metals, *therefore*, purgatory shall burn away those spiritual defilements which cleave to the inner man." This is very plausible, and may go down with boys; nay, indeed, such reasonings lie sometimes at the root of successful trading speculations amongst *men*, too. No doubt it is an analagous process which flatters the baldheaded into the virtue of bears' grease. "A fat bear has a shaggy hide, *therefore*, rub yourself with his grease, and you will get a thick head of hair." Very plausible argumentation, and highly satisfactory to the perfumer. Arguments, however, from body to spirit, from things temporal to things eternal, will be as certain to delude the infatuated dupe of priestly superstition, and to benefit the priests alone, as the logic of Rowland and Son is to delude the baldheaded, and to prove profitable to none but the firm themselves and the retailers of their ware.

Now, nothing is more certain than that the whole Bible teaches us

that that alone which takes effect upon the spirit of man, must be *intellectual* in its nature. Christianity works its wonders by operating on the human character; it moulds, and frames, and fashions *that*. "Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way? By taking heed thereto according to thy *word*." (Psalm cxix. 9.) "Thy *word* have I hid in my heart, that I might not sin against thee." (11th verse.) "Make me to *understand* the way of thy precepts." (27th verse.) "Give me *understanding*, and I shall keep thy law." (34th verse.) "Thy *word* hath quickened me." (50th verse.) And this is the spirit of the whole Scriptures. The spittle of Christ may be made instrumental to the recovery of eyesight, clay in his hands to the production of the same effect; but the grand spiritual medicament is *the word*—the manifestation of Christ to the soul. There may be influential circumstances connected with the work of conversion, and so there are; but the converting influence is, I repeat, the Living Word; Christ himself, and not a touch. You may anoint the skin of a man with ointment or with oil, or you may wash it with water; but this will not reach the soul, nor operate upon *its* character. Touching or rubbing, or eating or drinking, will not alter *that*, and he who inculcates the idea that it will, the victim doubtless of delusion himself, seeks, however unwittingly, to lead others astray also. That, then, which operates upon the soul is the *word* of persuasion, the *word* of wisdom, the *word* of power; the word which displays Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; which displays also the helpless degeneracy of mankind, and which leads man to see that the remedy for his misery is the apprehension of his God. "This is life eternal, to *know* thee, the only true God and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." God raises up the prostrate sinner by dispersing the clouds of ignorance that darken his understanding, by acquainting him with those truths which it concerns him to know, with what is right and what is wrong, with where his weakness lies and where his power. He exhibits himself as a reconciled Father in Christ Jesus; despondency vanishes. Bright hope stands forth. The spirit of malignity dies within him. Love and goodness are originated. The manacles of false shame, and the fetters of corrupting vanity drop off, and the regenerated man is at once seen to be a loving, active, enterprising, useful, and, because blessed of the Most High, a prosperous subject of the kingdom of God. I repeat, religion works its moral miracles by an influence on the character; by the production of a change of which the Holy Spirit is the Agent,—the Father the conceding, the Son the procuring Cause; and towards the production of which man merely acts as a dispenser of truths. By the development of the Word he raises the curtain. He brings before the mind the lightsome mysteries of redemption, setting forth Christ Jesus manifestly crucified before the people. (Gal. iii. 1.) The Word, then, is the quickening instrumentality; the sacraments, and every other Christian ordinance, are but means of grace, because they involve that Word which is the proper object of faith—"Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for *thee*, &c." (Rom. v. 6, 7, 8;

1 Thess. v. 10.) "Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for *thee*." (Hebrews ix. 14; 1 Peter i. 19, &c.) When I receive the eucharist in full assurance that Christ died for *me*, that his blood was shed for *me*; when I by faith do then and there appropriate to *myself* the spiritual blessings freely offered to all, then is it a heavenly banquet, and thus it becomes so. There is a difference in the circumstances of the faith which thus operates, but it is precisely in kind identical with that faith in Christ which I can exert in the closet with the door shut, or in the city, or in the field, or in the assembly (boisterous perhaps) of the elders and the people of Israel; aye, or of the Ammonites, the Moabites, and Hagarenes. In like manner, when the minister says, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," and that I can, by faith, lay hold on the promise which assures me that I am thus shut up in the ark of Christ's church, then and thus doth faith in the living Word instrumentally confer the promised blessing.

It is not the mere office of faith to bring us to the communion table, that the priest may there let us touch "the hem of the garment." No; the faith that brings us there converts the sacramental elements into a heavenly banquet too. "The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Lord's Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is thus received and eaten in the Supper, is faith." (Article 28, see also the 96th Article of the Irish Church.) "The Westminster Confession" (of the Church of Scotland) is equally clear on the point. "The grace which is exhibited in or by the sacraments, rightly used, is *not conferred by any power in them*; neither doth the efficacy of a sacrament depend upon the piety or intention of him that doth administer it, but upon the work of the Spirit, and the word of institution; which contains, together with a precept authorising the use thereof, a promise of benefit to worthy receivers." (Chap. xxvii.) And, therefore, we boldly take up the language of Luther, and declare, that if in the sacraments, faith in the words of Christ be exerted, though administered by a woman or a layman, they are even then effectually (although irregularly) received. In a word, religion brings its influences to bear upon the *soul* of man through *faith*; and the notion of Dr. Hook, that it operates through the skin, the *fauces*, the gullet, the stomach, or the digestive organs, as a medicament naturally or supernaturally might upon the body, is thoroughly, unquestionably, and dangerously Popish.

I abhor the Popery of Doctor Hook, and I know that the quickening instrument in the church is "the Word." Still I cannot doubt but that the Church neglects the use of powerful instrumentalities, additional to those which she employs.

What sounds are those which strike the ear in yonder lovely vale? They seem to cross that swelling mount, with olives green dispersedly adorned. Again a solemn stillness reigns—save that the dove, respon-

sive to her mate, coos forth soft music, and the united harmony of feathered songsters makes the groves resound. No voice of man is heard. A balmy fragrance fills the air, exhaled from shrub and flower. And *such* a scene! it is oriental all. Here the majestic cedar lifts his head, and pours his foliage to the gentle breeze. The cypress here is verdant, and here the aloe shows his prickly leaf, the hyssop, calamus, and cinnamon—all trees of frankincense, the fig and pomegranate, the clustering camphire, with the sycamore, cassia, and spikenard, and sweet-smelling myrrh, the lily, and the rose of Sharon display their loveliness, their fragrance shed. What luscious treasures weigh yon vineyard down, whose lord, in pride and confidence, surveys his stores, and calculates his gain? Sure here was Eden in earth's happy prime! The bosomed hills—the sloping vales in exquisite arrangement, present variety that never palls. That murmuring brook which now mid the tangled branches of ten thousand plants that would impede its flow, and now in the open vale meandering with gurgling sound, refreshes every sense, diffusing genial moisture through the noontide ray, pleasing the eye, slaking the vision thirst, and adding countless charms to the view—that brook is Kedron. The hill which crowns the valley where you stand is far-famed Olivet, and that sweet garden is Gethsemane. Southward down the glen that ancient monument, which, with its fine proportions strikes the eye, records a melancholy tale—beauty, and manly grace, and noble parts, degraded by ambition. They armed a son against a father's life, a royal son against a father's throne—the monument is Absalom's—"Absalom's pillar" called. The glen in which it is built is called the Valley of Jehosaphat. The mountains in the far distance stretch towards the wilderness. Skirting the horizon, Bethlehem appears. You just discern the outline of King David's native city. Eastward is Siloam. That noble hill just opposite—beyond the brook of Kedron and the vale, is Mount Moriah; and there is Zion, "the joy of the whole earth!" Begirt with a powerful rampart on the summit, stands distinct with many a tower and minaret, glorious in majesty, the holy city, type of our heavenly home, Jerusalem.—But hark, the cry again, and nearer now! Aloft to Olivet you turn your eyes, along the road to Bethphage, and lo! a moving mass presents itself. Scattered at first, then in array more dense—thousands on thousands crowd! Each bears a branch—most of them palm, some cedar, some of the spreading oak, of cypress some. A forest seems to move, more clear the sounds are heard—"Hosanna—blessed is he that comes! Hosanna—to the son of David! Our King Messiah comes, in the name of the Lord, Hosanna!" Boundless enthusiasm possesses all. Old men and maidens, young men and children, here every age is seen. Varied their costume, divers their accent. From the far north, from Tyre and Sidon, and the coast along to Joppa, rough mariners appear. Crowds come from Galilee and all its towns—Bethsaida and Genesareth, Capernaum and Corazin, Dalmanutha, Magdala, and Tiberias; and from the shores of the inland sea—crowds of the Gadarenes. From the midland country, beyond

Jordan, from Nazareth, Nain, and Cana, and from the foot of Tabor's Mount—each town, village, and hamlet supplies its quota. And in the midst, behold a superhuman man! In speculation wrapt he seems. His garb is humble. Upon his countenance you read inscribed vigour, decision, energy, but chiefly sorrow and grief—profound concern, deep anxiety, a purpose high, a mission heavenly. The observed of all observers, he rides upon an ass; yet, majesty and truth seem here incarnate! The most enthusiastic rush before and make a way, which instantly is strewn with branches, and with the garments of the multitude. Happy he counts himself whose cloak thus carpets over the meek man's path, while every hill re-echoes with "Hosanna!" The approaching cry reaches Jerusalem; an energy attends it. Inexplicable awe awakens and astounds, yet moves the citizens—these still, it would move the stones. They rush, they know not why, to every place of egress. Some through Solomon's gate, some through the postern on the north, afterwards called St. Stephen's. The most active scale the walls, and as the procession crosses the bridge of Kedron, far as eye can reach, a crowding mass appears. "It is the Nazarene!—Hosanna! It is Jesus the prophet of Nazareth, of Galilee!—Hosanna! It is the King, the Messiah! That prophet! The son of David, Hosanna! Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord!" Indifference is dead. None presumes to whisper enmity. The vast body enters the gate. They proceed along the street afterwards called *Via Dolorosa*, leaving the pool of Bethsaida on the left, straight to the temple, the cry of Hosanna becoming louder as they go. Here Jesus, still followed by the multitude, enters; finding the temple desecrated by money-changers, he overthrows their tables, and expels themselves, saying, "It is written, My house shall be called a house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of thieves."

It is little wonder that conduct so extraordinary should have awakened universal attention, and served to prepare the way for the conversion of thousands and tens of thousands to the truth. The contemplation of such a scene must needs produce great results. It awakens attention. It promotes inquiry. It leads to investigation. It results in faith. The exhibition of great multitudes powerfully swayed by a prevailing sentiment, is something like a demonstration of the rectitude of that sentiment. The voice of cavil is silenced by the acclamations of approving thousands; men become ashamed to object, when all the world approves. Such a proceeding as that which I have described, robs the devil of half his power. It presents mankind as auxiliary to the cause of God and of truth. As it is, to go along with religion, is the trial. To confess Christ is the difficulty; but in the face of such a demonstration as I have described, the difficulty lies in the other direction. The weakness of human nature, instead of finding a resting-place in infidelity, finds it in faith.

The Papists understand this; so, apparently, do the Tractarians; and so, also, do the Methodists. But the church seems not to have

reflected on the subject. I am glad that Mr. Newman in his "Developments of Christian Doctrine," overlooked the processional principle, a principle which I have long thought to be involved in the example here adduced. Had he urged the entrance of Christ into Jerusalem as illustrative of the pompous ceremonial attendant on Popish processions, I should have been almost apprehensive of putting the subject forward as I have done; but as he did not do so, I have no fear of being supposed to be identified with him in either doctrine or feeling. Seeing, however, as we do, the prevalence of infidelity, and the contempt of religion; and as the consequence of both, the grossness of the crime which afflicts our age, I trust that the thoughts which I have put forward in this place, may attract the attention and receive the consideration of some of those in high places, so as that the liberty of the church may be extended in the direction of which I have spoken.

Give the church, then, in every way her liberty. Let her throw open wide a door of usefulness to all her members. Let that niggard jealousy, which suspects danger unless the laity be altogether excluded from privilege, be done away. Let that body be engrafted into the church, which, animated by the true Catholic spirit, shrinks from division; yet, emboldened by Christian charity, and enjoying the warrant of the Spirit, lengthens the cords of the church, and strengthens her stakes almost against her will. Let it be really and cordially embraced, and its plans of usefulness acted out and glorified. Let the heads of the State be manifested as devoted to something superior to vanity and nonsense—as, in fact, the loving children of the church, and the bold professors of the doctrines which the church inculcates; and the result will be, that vice, wickedness, and crime, and with them, distress, oppression, and impoverishment, will be indefinitely diminished, while the general happiness and prosperity will flourish like a tree planted by the water-side.

The enlargement of the church's liberty; the extension of her means of usefulness; the presentation of her before the world as an immense moral agent; the so wielding of her doctrines and her influence, as as that they shall tell with power upon the masses; this is that which will at once regenerate society, and compel the belief that they who separate from the church, are narrow-minded malignants. The task of accomplishing Christian union can be effected by churchmen alone. I have very little hope from inconsistent amalgamations which contemplate not the removal of divisions, but the production of indifference to their existence. Of this, however, more in the next chapter. Meanwhile, on the subject of the working out of the Anglican system, I would beg to remind my readers of what I said in chapter iv., Part I.

I imagine that there can be no doubt that the world has never yet seen the Christian religion effectually carried out, and operating its results upon a great empire. In primitive times such a sight was impossible. The church was then in a state of persecution; the governments of the world stood in a position of hostility with respect

to it,' and the conversion of Constantine, whose influence drew over all the Roman empire to the profession of Christianity, scarcely altered the matter. The half-converted hordes which joined the church, with their indistinct views of spiritual truth, though they increased the boundaries of Christendom, added but little to the real strength of Christianity. Displaying but little of its influence upon their own lives and character, they could produce the manifestation of still less on the part of society. In fact, the leaven of that corruption which was speedily developed in the Papacy, was then strongly at work; and through the operation of a variety of deteriorating causes, the Roman empire, with the name of Christian, differed but little from the same empire when really and professedly Pagan. The same worldly-mindedness was every where predominant—the same vanity, luxury, and crime—the same martial and domineering spirit with its accompanying lust of conquest and power. The idolatry of the saints supplanted the idolatry of the Pagan divinities. Jupiter Tonans, christened by the name of St. Peter, still continued to receive the homage of his ancient worshippers, and the Juno of the Pantheon was adored under the title of the Virgin Mary. Midnight darkness soon set in, and the middle ages illustrated no other moral operation than that of a baleful prevalent superstition. The state of England since the Reformation, yea, its state at the present day, enables us to realize the condition of national happiness and dignity which might be attained to were our system only wrought out. The gradual growth of a pacific spirit is a distinct result of Christian feeling. Indeed everything now begins to be viewed in a true light. The plausible sophistries that have so long beguiled the world are growing into disrepute. They begin to be tested by the standard of questionable truth. Whence is this? It arises from the quiet operation of scriptural principle—the general reading of the Word of God. That Word is the mortal enemy of deception, delusion, vanity, pride, and nonsense of every kind. It strips off disguises; it brings men to realities. A man gets insulted by a friend—his pride is wounded—he calls him to the field, and shoots a bullet through his stomach; he thus makes his wife a widow, and his children vagabonds, who beg their bread. At such an achievement all the world cried out, a few years ago, "What a high-spirited man; what a brave fellow; what a gallant gentleman!" The study of the Word of God, however, has showed that such pride is an abomination; such a spirit of revenge detestable; such a deed of gallantry murder; and its consequence—Hell! And these unquestionable verities, when slept on and considered, have at last brought society to something like a right mind on the subject. The principle has only to be generalised, and it is as applicable to war, on a large scale, as it is to the *duello*. An analogous process of strict application of the scriptural standard has been applied to other subjects of a moral sort, and in every instance the result has been of a like satisfactory character. The proceeding in physical and abstract science has been similar, and its results no less gratifying. All *truth*

is of God. In proclaiming his name, he announces, "I am the truth." (John xiv. 6.) Truth is but the enunciation of realities, and it is God who has constituted things to be what they really are; consequently, the utterance of truth is the utterance of the constitutions of the Almighty. Mathematical truth is of God; physical truths are of God. They, therefore, who severely pursue discoveries in experimental philosophy, or in mathematical science, making the works of God, and unquestionable truth, their guide, may be considered as guided by light from heaven; and under the leadings of this unerring light, how vast has been the progress in every path of improvement! We require but to have the public mind directed to the Word of God, as the only unerring rule in morals—in the work of education—in the work of political economy, and we shall see changes in the moral condition of society, as vast as those which have almost revolutionised the world of physics. We convey light to our dwelling in conduits, which run beneath our feet in the streets. We fly across the country with a rapidity that exceeds the eagles, mounted on a tea-kettle; we traverse the kingdom, are sucked along through a pipe, at the rate of a hundred miles an hour; we whisper in Dublin, and swift as lightning, and loud as a trumpet, we are heard at Cork. Give the church her liberty; make the Word of God the rule; be severely governed by the oracles of Heaven; and soon shall we see moral miracles as great and as surprising as those which astound us in the material world. What do I mean by moral miracles? If, when Hodge came from his ploughing, he cast off his smock frock, put on a dress suit, went to dine with my lord duke, and entertained the company with a disquisition on the antiquities of Egypt; or if my lord duke and my Lady Mary came to dine with Hodge, and found sufficient to entertain them worthily, in a well-provided home, and in the cultivated intellect of the farmer and his household; or if the lads of the village entertained themselves, their parents, their sweethearts, and their neighbours, with an admirable performance of Handel's Messiah—the vocal and instrumental performances being conducted by themselves; or if the marquis had in his park a cotton mill, conceived in the most exquisite style of architecture, in which himself, the marchioness, the young ladies and gentlemen employed themselves, as useful recreation, in the production of beautiful fabrics, which they disposed of merely for the promotion of the general happiness; if sordid cupidity departed from the trading community, heartless vanity from the fashionable circles, discontent and repining from the lower ranks; these would be moral miracles; I do not say whether these are they or not to which it is my object to direct the attention of my readers. I wish, however, to direct it to something more noble than investments in consols or huckaback. I will not, however, particularise, lest I should be thought an enthusiast. I must dispense milk as to babes, and not strong meat as to men; but knowing what I speak, and whereof I affirm, I feel not the slightest hesitation in alleging, that the path to national felicity is set before us in the Word of God.

That if followed as it ought to be, it cannot disappoint; and that the true mode of facilitating the achievement of the blessing, lies in the enlargement of the liberties of the church.

There are two sorts of faith—first, *ingenite* faith; and, secondly, *demonstrative* faith.

1st. The first is of the nature of inspiration. The 2nd, of the nature of logical inference. Both exist in the Christian religion. 1. There are the most abundant promises all through the Scripture, that the true Christian shall be divinely instructed by God himself. "All thy children shall be taught of God." "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh." "If any man will do his will, he shall *know* of the doctrine whether it be of God." "Ye have no need that any man should teach you, but as the anointing [the Holy Spirit] teacheth you of truth, and is no lie, even so ye shall abide in Him." Such passages as these clearly show, that when religion is in its full exercise, the Christian enjoys supernatural communications—direct instruction from Heaven. "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." "Faith is the substance of things hoped for." It is not a mere hope that we shall at last enjoy God and heaven, but it is the actual enjoyment of both here on earth. Such faith as this may be called "*ingenite*," it is *born in* a man's own nature. As such, it is living, fruitful, vitalising. Now, this is the first order of faith. And it is accessible to all. If an ignorant man, a mechanic, or an agriculturist, come before God, and seek him through Jesus Christ, and through him alone, and really "wills to do his will," such a person will obtain a full assurance—a perfect certainty, on the subject of every important doctrine of the Christian religion. There will not be left within his mind the shadow of a doubt with respect to any essential doctrinal truth. Moreover, he will obtain wisdom from on High, so that he will be able to distinguish with the nicest discrimination between shades of doctrine, so as to determine the right and the wrong with an infallible certainty, and thus to reject the one and to choose the other. This *ingenite* faith is perfectly satisfying to the individual himself, and renders him "steadfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord." But it does not enable him effectually to silence the cavils of infidels or sceptics. It renders him superior to these cavils; it makes him to laugh them to scorn. But it does not enable him to answer, to refute, to explode them. 2. Here *demonstrative* faith comes in. By *demonstrative* faith I mean, such a belief of Christianity as springs from an acquaintance with its reasonableness: its demonstrableness, the grounds of evidence on which it rests. In a manner totally irrespective of its operation upon the soul, 'an individual examines into the facts on the truth of which religion rests. He sifts the historical testimony which informs us that Jesus was miraculously born—announced himself as a messenger from heaven—wrought stupendous miracles to prove his mission—was crucified, dead and buried, rose again the third day, and ascended into

heaven. I repeat, he examines into the historical evidence of these facts, and he finds he can no more doubt them, than he can doubt the conquest of Britain by Julius Cæsar, or its subjection afterwards to Norman conquerors; and thus coerced by argument into an admission of the facts of the Gospel history, he yields his assent to those Gospel doctrines which teach him to expect, through Christ, life and immortality as the result of faith—or through the rejection of Christ, eternal punishment as the result of unbelief. The nature of the proof presented by the advocates of Christianity to inquirers is various. Paley, adopts one course; Leslie, another; Butler, another; and so on.

Now, may it not be asked, if every man may obtain positive certainty on the subject of religion by the teaching of God himself, why should he be at the trouble of hunting for proofs through the arguments of his fellowmen? Can there be a necessity for human logic, where there is divine teaching? for a school-master, or a divinity lecturer, when we may have Christ himself, or the Holy Ghost? Why should we fatigue ourselves with the acquisition of a faith that is demonstrative, when we may have one that is ingenite? I reply, there is no reason that we should do so as it respects ourselves, but it is desirable as it respects others; and the existence of demonstrative faith is calculated to advance the glory of religion. Though ingenite faith is the superior faith, if there were none other, sneering infidels might say—"These Christians are nothing but fanatics. They rest their belief upon a spiritual influence that we believe to be all moonshine—they speak of the teaching of the Holy Ghost, but we have never been able to obtain anything of the kind. Hence, since they repose on such grounds, we renounce their opinions altogether." The existence, however, of reasonable demonstration for Christian truth—demonstration that is totally independent of any spiritual influence whatsoever, and which enables the Christian to stand up before a man of the world, and to prove to his face, however he may sneer, that the Gospel is true, and he but a fool who rejects it, must be admitted to be an advantage of no small importance.

Nevertheless, if we rest content merely with demonstrative faith, we stop short of the blessing altogether. "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his;" hence, while we should assure ourselves that the Gospel is true, we should not feel easy until its truth has been made, through the operation of the Holy Ghost, effectual to our own souls. When we have learned by logic, by argumentation, by the strictest reasoning, that Christ is a Saviour, we should not stop until he have actually saved us. Each learned Christian should be able to say, I know by reasoning that Christ has come to save the world; I know by divine influence that he has certainly saved *me*. It is *pleasing* to know that the Christian religion can be proved—that it is a reasonable system; but it is *essential* that it should be experienced as a saving one.

It was ingenite faith that worked at the era of the Reformation, and

some time subsequently. The Luthers and the Calvins, the Cranmers, and Knoxes, and Brownes, were taught of God. And the same lively faith prevailed during the whole Reformation struggle, and down to the times of our Medes and Usshers. Subsequently to the Restoration, a flood of infidelity deluged the British islands; and, indeed, at the same time, prevailed all over the world. God raised up the demonstrative divines to meet the emergency. We live in an age when we have inherited their labours, and have been privileged to see a great revival of inborn faith. Be it the business of every true Christian to work, in order that the living principle may be more and more diffused.

And now for that application of this subject which I consider appropriate to the occasion.

As an individual derives his religion from the direct teaching of God, through the Spirit, so a nation derives its happiness, its prosperity, and its power, from the divine blessing—it is the gift of God. "Righteousness exalteth a nation." "The eyes of the Lord run to and fro throughout the whole earth, to show himself strong in the behalf of them whose heart is perfect towards him." (2 Chronicles xvi. 9.) And the whole history of Israel, a people raised up for our instruction, illustrates the subject, for they prospered—they were happy—they were invincible, so long as they served the Lord. They were miserable and wretched, weak and contemptible, when they neglected his service.

Does not such information as this render altogether unnecessary the doctrines of the political economists? Their science is intended to point out the way in which national wealth is accumulated, and the prosperity of communities secured. But what maxim can they lay down more certain than this, that "righteousness exalteth a nation?" Let princes devote themselves to bring their people to "seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness," and, then, what "they may eat, and what they may drink, and wherewithal they may be clothed, will be added unto them." "Every man will sit under his own vine, and under his own fig-tree." They talk of the springs of individual aggrandisement and national wealth. They speak as though men had in their own hands the origination of their prosperity, and nations of their power. But what was it that created the genius of a Shakspeare, of a Milton, of a Newton? three such minds would make a people great; so many mines of gold, silver, or precious stones, would be of inferior worth, calculated even on the low and grovelling estimate of pecuniary value. Mr. Dickens, in our own day, has been a magazine of wealth to the booksellers. He has spread many a table with roast beef and plum-pudding, and adorned many a fine lady in silks, satins, feathers, and finery—what produced his mind? Whether it may have been abused or improved is not the question; in either case, it is the handy work of the Almighty. What made Wellington the shield and sword of Europe? God. Whence Rosse, Watt and Arkwright, Chantry, Kirk and Maclise, Scott and Maturin, Byron

and Moore, in one word, what is the source of mental power, of towering intellect, of surpassing genius? Him, to whom we all kneel in the morning, and say, "Our Father, which art in Heaven," Jesus Christ, the Holy Ghost—three Persons in one ever blessed God. Every theory, then, to which the political economist can trace individual or general prosperity, is briefly comprehended in one saying—Godliness hath promise of the life that now is. (See 1 Tim. iv. 8.) In short, as ingenite faith is the gift of God, and supersedes the necessity for faith demonstrated, so is national prosperity the gift of God, and supersedes the necessity for seeking it through the doctrines of the political economists.

Nevertheless, as there is an occasion for demonstrative faith also, so there may be an occasion for looking into the working of cause and effect, through which Providence accomplishes his purposes. The social system viewed as a machine in the hand of God, and those wheels within wheels which contribute to its successful working, contemplated as but subordinate to the contriving and the moving power, may lead to the glorification of our Heavenly Father. If it do, it is all well. But if our wisdom lead us to think that we can supersede divine operation, disaster, calamity, and disappointment will, and ought to be, the result. Political economists have taught statesmen how capital grows and contributes to the general comfort; their calculations involve no consideration of the discountenance of idolatry, of a bold national protest against it, of mercy, kindness, and respect to the poor man; and, consequently, our infidel wiseacres, our Macauleys and Maculochs; our purse-proud earthlings, our grave simpletons, our energetic imbeciles, our Peels and our Cobdens, our Grahams and our Brights, begin to teach priests to bless salt and drive the devil out of water—to build bastiles, to grind the faces of the poor, and clothe the representatives of Christ in felon's garb; and all this to enhance the national power, increase the national wealth, and add terror to the national name. They succeed in their schemes, they accomplish their plans, and what then? Starvation, with haggard countenance, marches into our homesteads. The name of England is despised, and the strength of England contemned; and on a sudden an extraordinary appetite possesses the nations of the earth—America, France, and Irish Papists, professedly; Russia, Spain, Italy, all the Continent of Europe, in truth; I say, one single appetite possesses them all, and what is that? to sweep Englishmen from the surface of the earth. The land that was honoured, esteemed, exalted, is viewed as base, degraded, and dishonourable! To ruin her outright, what is demanded? To reduce her proud fleets to fire-wood for wreckers? To cut her armies to pieces? To make her strength as tow, her power as rottenness, and her glory as dust. What are the conditions? A tempest blowing S. S. West on the day that Prince Joinville sets out for Ireland. An unlucky fog on the morning that Soult and General Cass attack Wellington and Colonel O'Fogarty on the Curragh of Kildare! O blind

and infatuated England! O base and traitorous Peel! O besotted "F M., the Duke of Wellington!"

If there be not disaster stored up for England in the treasures of heaven, we should burn our Bibles, disband the church, and begin to play at bagatelle!

But is there a remedy? Yes, there is, thank God! One—Repentance for the past! A bold retrogression of our backslidings, and, as instrumental to both, *liberty for the church.*

CHAPTER V.

CHRISTIAN UNION TO BE PROSECUTED BY MAKING MANIFEST THE SUPERIOR CLAIMS OF THE CHURCH CATHOLIC.

There can be no sort of doubt about the matter; it is churchmen themselves who must undertake the task of doing away with the divisions of the Protestant world. Little benefit can be expected from co-operation with men who are so seriously astray as the "anti-state-church" people are. I would put the thing thus. Suppose it were announced to the public, that her Majesty, acting under the advice of her responsible advisers, was about to come down to parliament, and in the royal speech to announce that she was impressed with the conviction that the prevalence of infidelity and religious error was productive of great crime and wickedness, and much national distress; and that measures would be submitted to parliament, which contemplated through the circulation of the Holy Scriptures, and the promotion of increased activity in the church, the removal of those spiritual disorders and their sad consequences—suppose this were done, and then suppose thousands of so-called Christian ministers to rise up with indignation, and to array their congregations into hostility to such a proposition, upon the ground that the State had no right to interfere with religion, what would be the verdict which a Christian mind must pronounce upon such a line of conduct? Would it be designated by any milder epithet than infamous? The patience that would stop, even to canvass its merits, might, perhaps, justly be regarded as indicative of criminal apathy. To say that Christian men might approve of an expenditure of the national money to buy ropes to strangle highwaymen, or gunpowder to blow the brains out of burglars, or bayonets to be thrust through the bowels of sinners, or to pay Peelers (our Irish gens-d'armes) for extending them, bleeding and dying, on the ground, as a terror to evil doers; but that they would be warranted in making an outcry against the employment of those spiritual instrumentalities which might convert them from the errors of their ways, and save their souls alive, is a proposition so monstrous,

that I do not think it can for one single moment be entertained. And yet the "anti-state church" people say no less. Rather than that the Government should interfere to convert the people, they would see them all go to the devil. Rather than call upon the Government to Christianise Maynooth, they would let it give £28,000 a year for its endowment. Now, I would ask, can any benefit arise from uniting with such men as these? We united with them in opposing the increased grant to the Roman Catholic college of Maynooth; perhaps it was that union which frustrated our plans, and caused them all to end in disappointment. Had the church on that occasion stood alone, resisted the ministerial proposition on principle, and in contrast with the delinquency which that proposition involved, pressed upon the Government the duty that it owed to the spiritual interests, to the souls of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, and allowed Dissenters to oppose it in theirs, their conjoint though dissociated efforts might have been less open to the charge of compromise on both hands than they were, and have been attended with a greater measure of success.* The same sort of reasoning will still apply. A general anxiety is felt for Christian union; that the anxiety should be more and more extended and influential, must be the prayer of every Christian, but how is it to be effected? Thus—let churchmen candidly consider the improvements that may be made in the working of the reformed Catholic body; viewing their dissenting brethren with cordial affection, let them labour to have adopted in the church, every valuable plan of usefulness, whencesoever it may be learned—so that everything that is admirable in any sect, may be found in the ancient apostolic body of our country—let Dissenters on the other hand pray for the mitigation of that spirit of antagonism with which the church has been viewed—let them look with more anxiety for grounds of union, than for those of separation—let them so prepare the minds of their brethren, that they may be ready to welcome every amelioration in the working of the church—and thus acting—both churchmen and Dissenters, though they may work separately, will see a greater progress towards Christian union made, than they would be likely to see, if by compromise on both sides, they anticipated true and genuine unity by an affected indifference to divisions.

So far from thinking that division is likely to be promoted by a bold, diligent, and faithful maintenance of church principles, as contradistinguished from the ecclesiastical views of the Dissenters—I imagine that the contrary is the case. If Dissenters be allowed to rest under the impression that the church lays claim to no higher *status* than their own, they will be hardened in their separation. At the same time, I should think it equally improper, if not more so, to press upon them the defects of their separated condition in an arrogant or haughty spirit—a spirit which must needs be insulting, or in forgetfulness of those spiritual shortcomings, on the church's part, which must be allowed to palliate their separation, or even, as I have before expressed it, to have lent to it, occasionally at least, a temporary justification.

* See Appendix.

Prayerful humility is becoming, indeed it is demanded on both sides; and if this feeling be brought into existence, there is every reason to hope, that Dissenters may begin to consider the great advantages which the peculiar constitution of the church affords to it against the common enemy—Popery; and, on the other hand, churchmen may begin to consider the advantages which the church would derive from the appropriation of some of that zeal and spirit, and as far as it may be proper and practicable, of any of those plans of usefulness which the practices of the Dissenters may commend. But there should be no compromise of truth on the part of churchmen, contrariwise, when it is gainsayed, there should be a stern assertion of it. For example: when it is alleged by Dissenters that church property belongs to the nation, that it might or should be sold off, distributed according to legislative or some other decision, and the ministers of religion thrown for their support upon the voluntary contributions of those flocks which they may chance to gather, or of those who have chosen them as religious teachers; why should there be any hesitation in boldly proclaiming that such language involves the most frightful falsehood, proposes the most flagrant robbery, and, if realized, would necessarily produce a revolution that would overwhelm in ruin the United Kingdom.

The property of the church is not public property. It is as undeniably the property of the church, as the property of the aristocracy belongs to them; and it would be just as great a robbery to alienate the property of the Archbishop of Dublin, for example, and distribute it for what might be considered the public good, as it would be to alienate the property of the Honourable Sydney Herbert, and make a distribution of it under a like pretence. The property of the ancient aristocracy, in most instances, originated in royal donation, and such, in great part, was the property of the church. It is upon this ground alone, namely, that it was a royal donation that the property of the church could be said to have been originally public property. I omit the consideration that a vast quantity of it was the gift of private individuals. But conceding, for argument sake, that it was all of royal gift, what else is the property of the aristocracy? And if there be a flaw in the title of property because it is of royal donation, that flaw will not be got rid of by its transfer. Let it change hands ever so often, if the original title were not good, the present possessor is a usurper. Hence, if the church can be ousted of its possessions because they originally flowed from the voluntary bounty of the prince, there is not a man,—from the duke whose pedigree dates from the conquest, to Mr. Murphy, the grocer, that invested £20,000 in land at the last chancery auction,—who may not be turned adrift, houseless and penniless, to-morrow; and depend upon it, that there is a God to whom vengeance belongeth, who will take care that the spoliation of his church shall be adequately visited upon the infidel community that would allow it. Do we not, in fact, see something very like this process now going forward? But the other day there was a loud outcry against the Irish church. The Protestant laity of Ireland, nobles and

people, instead of turning out with irresistible determination to oppose the spoiler, not only were passive, but became in some sort parties to his crime and partakers of his plunder. They allowed the fee-simples of the church to be alienated. The gentry took possession of a fourth of the tithe property of the church, and upon what ground? Why, upon the ground that it was public property; and what now? Why, now we see a conspiracy against rents, more bloody and as general as was the conspiracy against tithes; and we see the decrees of the midnight legislator enforced by the bullet of the mid-day assassin!

But, then, it is not just that the professors of one religion should pay the ministers of another. This is a favourite argument with O'Connell; he says, Protestants get their souls cured by Protestant ministers, and then send those ministers to get their payment from Roman Catholics, who reject their ministrations. He illustrates the grievance by the case of the man who should get himself supplied with a coat, and send the tailor with his bill to a neighbour for payment. The illustration is piquant enough, were it only recommended by truth and applicability, but it is quite the contrary. The real state of the case is this. When a Roman Catholic becomes tenant of a farm, he has two landlords; 1st—the parson of the parish, and 2ndly—the holder of the fee or lease, as the case may be. He binds himself to pay for his land nine-tenths to one, and one-tenth, or a tithe, to another—for *his land*, mind. The parson has as good a right to his one-tenth of the land as the landlord has to his nine-tenths; and what the tenant gets from the parson is not religion, but land! Yet, notwithstanding, when the rent or gale day comes round, the tenant sends his compliments to the doctor, saying, that he has a great dislike to parsons, and that he will not pay him his due, because he (the parson) has an objection to the mass! The just illustration of this case would be the following:—O'Connell gets credit for a coat, and then sends word to the tailor that he will not pay him, because he is a Protestant, which he knew at first! In the true case, the value received is the tenement; in the case supposed, it is the coat; payment is declined in both, because of objections to the religion of the proprietor. What an admirably just man Mr. O'Connell is, who refuses to pay a Protestant tailor!—what a praiseworthy “Catholic” he must be, who rises up in indignation against an heretical tinker, and refuses to pay for Protestant crockery! Who can avoid exalting the conscientious virtue of the man who grows fat on Protestant dinners, but refuses to pay the cook?—“his conscience” will not allow him! “His conscience” allowed him to eat the dinners, and “his conscience” allowed him to promise to pay for them, but then his promising “conscience” was hungry, and his performing “conscience” is replenished; and is it not quite natural that a hungry “conscience” and a full “conscience” should be consciences of a very different sort?

Nothing can be more groundless than to imagine, that the state of things in America should afford a precedent for that state of things which should be found amongst ourselves. The original settlers in

America peopled the country under a covenant of equality for the colonising sects. If any body calling itself a church in that country were to pretend to a claim on the tithes of the land, it were an unfounded pretence, an attempt at usurpation. The circumstances of the church in that country are as different from the circumstances of the church with us, as the circumstances of a man born a pauper are from those of the heir of an estate; and to argue that the lawful claimant of an hereditary property has no title to his possessions because his neighbour is born a mendicant, is quite as sound a piece of reasoning, as to argue that the Church of England has no right to her property because the church in America has no property to allege a right to.

In fine, there is not one single attribute of our church that she is not able to maintain in the field of argument; and it is by a manifestation of the reasonableness of all her demands, the justice of all her claims—it is by the bold and fearless refutation of those who deny them, rather than by a kind of silent acquiescence in their statements and a contentment to be placed upon their level, that she may expect to see the voice of cavil stopped, and a disposition to union with her displayed.

The remedy, then, for those divisions that are extrinsic to the church, is to be expected rather in the modification of her own conduct, than in any improper concessions of her high claims.

CHAPTER VI.

OUR DIVISIONS—II. INTRINSIC. THEIR CAUSES AND REMEDIES.

Having considered the divisions of British Protestantism which are extrinsic to the Church, their nature, their causes, and the remedy which they admit of, we come—

II. *To the intrinsic divisions of the Church*; those, namely, which, existing in our own body, weaken and distract us, render us a scorn to our enemies, and constitute a source of bitterness amongst ourselves.

Of such divisions there are, I think, three causes. These may not be, perhaps, each independent of the other. They act mutually and together. The first produces the second, and the second occasionally the first; both are magnified, aggravated, and prolonged by the third, if they do not, also, actually grow out of it. The language which the Poet applies to a different, though not inappropriate case, has something like an application here:—

“Faults in the life breed errors in the brain,
And these reciprocally those again;

The mind and conduct mutually imprint,
 And stamp their image on each others mint;
 Each sire and dam of an infernal race,
 Begetting and conceiving all that's base."

Progress of Error.

Our intrinsic divisions, then, spring from—1st, false doctrine; 2ndly, State corruption; and, 3rdly, defective charity.

1. Errors in doctrine always imply rejection of the truth and hostility to it, and they are negative and positive in their character. The former would deny the doctrines of the Scripture, the latter would corrupt them. The result of the former is indifferentism, or latitudinarianism, tending towards infidelity. The result of the latter is superstition, tending towards Popery. When they exist within the Church, they manifest themselves, on the one hand, in Unitarianism, of various shades, on the other, in Tractarianism, which varies in the degree of its intensity in individuals and the circles which they influence.

The genuine doctrines of the Church are evangelical—to be sure they are. Can this be doubted by any one who knows that they accord in the main with the doctrine of the reformers—of Luther, of Calvin, of Zuinglius? These were regarded by our Cranmers, Latimers, and Riddleys—by our Jewels, our Usshers, and our Medes, as brethren in Christ; and the Articles and Homilies which we have derived from the labours of our reformers indicate as much.

Indeed this is made perfectly obvious by the consistent hostility with which the doctrines, and if not the doctrines, the temper of those Articles and Homilies, are viewed by the victims of error on both sides. How many volumes have been written by archbishops, or dedicated to them, for the sole purpose of subverting the following principle of our Church! "Christ is now the righteousness of all them that truly do believe in him. He, for them, paid the ransom by his death. He, for them, fulfilled the law in his life. So that now in him, and by him, every true Christian man may be called a fulfiller of the law; forasmuch as that which their infirmity lacketh, Christ's justice hath supplied." *First Part of the Homily on Salvation.*

Here is the grand doctrine which the admirable Martin Luther so amply proved, and so largely developed in his noble commentary on the Galatians. And yet you will find men whose Christian constitution is of the genuine chip-in-porridge character; men whom it would appear almost impossible to move by any Christian topic, excited into rage and fury, at the assertion of this simple Church doctrine. The principle of this passage is the very principle of life, energy, and power in the Church. Its vital profession, its heartfelt acceptance, marks one that has fathomed the depths of heavenly wisdom, and to draw it out, and apply it, is to pour new life upon the Church; still there are those who should shed your quarts of ink, and blot your reams of paper, in fiddle-faddle treatises on the A B C of Christian evidences. Think of treatises "on the evidences" in *this* age! Treatises on the

multiplication table; "considerations" on two and two being four, and then other "considerations" on two and three being five, and like "considerations" carried on, "in series of essays," for a whole life long. How edifying would such sham philosophy be in this nineteenth century! I say you will find men with perverse diligence deluding themselves and the public by countless volumes on the merest elements of the faith, who have never published, or caused to be published, one single sentence that did not breathe enmity against the above doctrine—such doctrines as the above, and, in general, against "the deep things of God." (1 Cor. x. 10.)

And if enmity mark their feeling towards the doctrines of our church as set forth in its Articles and Homilies, how much more do they exhibit a detestation of the tone and temper of these formularies! The Articles and Homilies bespeak throughout, and inculcate a glowing zeal against Popery. With them the mass is a "blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit," an "idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;" the Pope is "Antichrist;" the Church of Rome "the Babylonical beast;" "not only a harlot, (as the Scripture calleth her), but also a foul, filthy, withered, old harlot (for she is, indeed, of ancient years), to be abhorred as the foulest and filthiest harlot that ever was seen." Such is the tone of the Homilies as it respects Popery. And surely if they are to be received at all, they should be received *ex animo*, and produce a language accordant with their own; yet never is such language expressed, nor the zeal which it indicates manifested, that we do not find an immense outcry raised against indecency of expression and want of charity in feeling. Mark, however, with what admirable discrimination the Homilies themselves distinguish between intemperance in language and a becoming zeal against that which is mischievous or false. "Truth it is, indeed, that there is a time when it is convenient to answer a fool, according to his foolishness, lest he should seem in his own conceit to be wise. And sometime it is not profitable to answer a fool according to his foolishness, lest the wise man be made like to the fool. When our infamy, or the reproach that is done unto us, is joined with the peril of many, then it is necessary, in answering, to be quick and ready. For we read that many holy men of good zeal have sharply and fiercely both spoken and answered tyrants and evil men; which sharp words came not of anger, rancour, or malice, or desire of vengeance, but of a fervent desire to bring them to the true knowledge of God, and from ungodly living, by an earnest and sharp rebuke and chiding. In this zeal St. John the Baptist called the Pharisees *adders' brood*, (Matt. iii.), and St. Paul called the Galatians *fools*, (Gal. iii.) and the men of Crete he called *liars, evil beasts, and sluggish bellies*; (Titus i.) and the false Apostles he called *dogs and crafty workmen*. (Phil. iii.) And this zeal is godly and to be allowed, as it is plainly proved by the example of Christ, who, although he was the fountain and spring of all meekness, gentleness, and softness, yet he called the obstinate Scribes and Pharisees 'blind guides,' 'fools,' 'painted graves,' 'hypocrites,' 'serpents,' 'adders' brood,' '

corrupt and wicked generation.' (Matt. xxiii.) Also he rebuked Peter, eagerly, saying: '*Go behind me, Satan.*' (Matt. xxi.) Likewise St. Paul reproveth Elymas, saying: '*O thou, full of all craft and guile, enemy to all justice, thou ceaseest not to destroy the right ways of God, and now, lo! the hand of the Lord is upon thee, and thou shalt be blind and not see for a time.*' (Acts xiii.) - And St. Peter reprehendeth Ananias very sharply, saying: '*Ananias, how is it that Satan hath filled thy heart, that thou shouldst lie unto the Holy Ghost?*' (Acts v.) This zeal hath been so fervent in many good men, that it hath stirred them not only to speak bitter and eager words, but also to do things which might seem to some to be cruel, but indeed they be very just, charitable, and godly, because they were not done of ire, malice, or contentious mind, but of a fervent mind, to the glory of God and the correction of sin, executed by men called to that office."—*Homily against Contention.*

Thus does the church distinctly assert the existence of a proper occasion for that severe and uncompromising reproof of religious error, which she has set us an example of, pronouncing its motive to be Christian charity, and doing so in an essay expressly written against strife and contention. She does not inculcate messages of "peace, when there is no peace;" nor the utterance of "smooth things," when rough rebuke is demanded; and yet, at the same time, her whole spirit is that of the most cordial love and charity.

If there be one thing the Bible holds up to reprobation, both by precept and example, it is the weakness that would prefer a sentimental benevolence to the stern demands of principle. The Old Testament was a dispensation of law. It did not supply a converting principle. It did not hold out a hope that idolaters might be turned from the evil of their ways, and that spiritual labours were to be employed to produce that conversion. On the contrary, it seems to have regarded their case as hopeless, as without remedy, and as such the precept with respect to them was extirpation; the pity that would spare them was solemnly denounced, and occasionally visited with the most severe retribution. "If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder come to pass, whereof he spoke unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods which thou hast not known, and let us serve them; thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams; for the Lord your God proveth you, to know whether ye love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul. Ye shall walk after the Lord your God, and fear him. And that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams, shall be put to death, because he hath spoken to turn you away from the Lord your God; so shalt thou put the evil away from the midst of thee. If thy brother, the son of thy mother, or thy son, or thy daughter, or the wife of thy bosom, or thy friend, which is as thine own soul, entice thee secretly, saying, Let us go and serve other gods which thou hast not known, thou nor thy fathers; thou shalt not consent unto him, nor hearken unto him;

neither shalt thine eye pity him, neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou conceal him: but thou shalt surely kill him; thine hand shall be first upon him to put him to death, and afterwards the hand of the people. And thou shalt stone him with stones, that he die. If thou shalt hear say in one of thy cities which the Lord thy God hath given thee to dwell there, saying: Certain men, the children of Belial, are gone out from among you, and have withdrawn the inhabitants of their city, saying—Let us go and serve other gods which ye have not known. Then shalt thou inquire and make search, and ask diligently; and behold, if it be truth, and the thing certain, that such abomination is wrought among you, thou shalt surely smite the inhabitants of that city with the edge of the sword, destroying it utterly, and all that is therein, and the cattle thereof, with the edge of the sword." (Deut. xiii.) And according to those precepts, we find the most applauded of the Jewish authorities severe in the execution of such statutes, and those punished who were not so. The following instances illustrate the subject involving the same sternness of principle. Because Saul spared Agag, he was deprived of the throne of Israel; and Samuel, with his own hand, in a manner that might be called merciless, hewed him (Agag) in pieces before the Lord. (1 Samuel ix. 33.) When King Ahab spared Benhadad, he was thus addressed by a prophet, specially and divinely commissioned to reprove him. "Because thou hast let go out of thy hand a man whom I appointed to utter destruction, therefore thy life shall go for his life, and thy people for his people." (1st Kings xx. 35, 42.) And it is in accordance with this principle that Jehu, after his sanguinary extirpation of the house of Ahab, was thus addressed and rewarded: "And the Lord said unto Jehu: Because thou hast done well in executing that which is right in mine eyes, and hast done unto the house of Ahab according to all that was in mine heart, thy children of the fourth generation shall sit on the throne of Israel." (2 Kings x. 30.) The passages which I have quoted on this subject are but illustrations of the tone of the whole Bible. Save with respect to their sanguinary and penal character, we should regard them as setting before us the mortal opposition which we should render to Antichristian idolatry. We live under a dispensation of the Spirit. The counsel of God is adequately revealed. There is a hope of the conversion of the most hardened idolater; mercy is offered to the chief of sinners. Our duty is to announce that mercy, to promulgate the invitations of Divine love; we are to cry, "Turn ye, turn ye, why will ye die!" But we are to do all this in the expression of the utter abhorrence in which God holds idolatrous apostasy, in the exhibition of the frightful doom that he has denounced upon it, and in the determined refusal to admit to terms of fraternity those who are leaders in, or professors of, the spiritual delusion. In fact, the conduct of our church and its language, with respect to Popery, show clearly how the Old Testament analogy applies. We are to adopt the language, to accord with the tone, and to conform to the temper, with respect to Popery, which our church has manifested. She has laid down for us

the rule which we are to follow, and whether they be bishops or archbishops, Hebrew professors of Oxford, or Donnellan lecturers in Dublin, who presume to prescribe mildness and moderation of phrase, when the Word of God and the Church of God have prescribed and set us the example of a line of conduct and a system of address that are directly the contrary, it is our solemn duty to pronounce them blind guides, false prophets, rebellious rulers, children that are corrupters.

Blessed be God for our Holy Church! for the venerable men who settled its formularies, and transmitted them to us sealed with their own blood! What a pitiable condition we should be in had these men acted upon the independent hypothesis, and left us without Creeds, without Articles, without Homilies. Had they done this, were we in the hapless condition that such conduct on their part would have placed us in, to what purpose would be our denunciations of Popish idolatry? They would be laughed to scorn they would be worse than persecuted; they would be scoffed at. The bishops would pronounce our strong language heretical, and pronounced inapplicable, it would be held in derision by the age. Our petitions to the Legislature against Popery would be rejected as insulting; our addresses on the subject to the Queen would be sent back to us as offensive to her Majesty's subjects; whereas, through the faithfulness of those men of God, in everything we say against Popery, we now rest upon the pillar and the ground of truth, and we brand upon the brow of those who reject our doctrines, or reprove our tone, the opprobrious stigma of disgraceful heterodoxy. In fact, our church is a bundle of paradoxes, and he is no true churchman who is not as paradoxical as herself. The true churchman, then, should be as evangelical as the puritans, and as high church as the Papists; he should denounce Popery as though he would not tolerate it, and still he should be as loving to Papists as though they were brethren. He should anathematise the doctrine of justification by works as much as if he were an Antinomian, yet he should insist on the necessity of good works as much as if they were saving in their nature; he should dwell upon the importance of supernatural faith as though Christianity had no reasonable evidence to rest upon, and urge its reasonable acquisition as much as if there were no reality in divine teaching; he should denounce Popery as though he were devoid of love, and preach affection towards the Papist as though he were devoid of zeal. These apparent contradictions are not only reconcileable with the Christian character, but necessary to its perfection; and, suiting as they do the present age, they had their parallel in primitive times. Hear how the Apostle Paul, in a well known passage speaks, (2 Cor. vi. 4, 10,) "In all things approving ourselves as the ministers of God. . . . By honour and dishonour, by evil report and good report: as deceivers, and yet true; as unknown, yet well known; as dying, and behold we live; as chastened, and not killed; as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things." To have had honour without dishonour, evil report without good

report ; to have been deceivers without being true ; to have been sorrowful without joy ; to have endured a poverty that was uncounteracted by spiritual riches, would be to have been no Christians at all ; and in like manner to denounce Popery without love towards Roman Catholics, or to feel love towards Roman Catholics without denouncing Popery ; to be high church with reference to order, without being evangelical in reference to doctrine ; or to be evangelical in point of doctrine, without any sense of order as it respects discipline ; to preach free grace without urging Christian practice, or to urge Christian practice without the foundation of free grace, &c. &c., indicates an imperfect state of Christian character, if it do not necessarily involve vital defect. In order, then, that error may be excluded, let conformity with the church in every respect be sought, and when perfectly conformed to the church, we shall then agree with one another, and the divisions which spring from false doctrine be done away.

Our Articles, Liturgy, and Homilies are the compositions, compilations, or selections of our reformers. We may be sure they speak what their mind really was. Here we have their principles and their feelings embodied ; here we may learn their character, and discover what it was which led them to prefer poverty rather than riches ; the faggot and the stake, rather than luxury and the palace ; death rather than life : in the vehemence of their language, as well as in the nature of their principles, the mystery is developed. Had they been more bland, they would have been less determined. Had they been less "uncharitable," "abusive," "narrow-minded," "ill-tempered," "fanatical," or "enthusiastic,"—for it is in such terms the men who now adopt their language and follow in their footsteps are denounced—they would have been more compliant ; we should be slaves, and perhaps the world would yet have to learn what liberty was ; it is just because they were the characters that their writings exhibit them that we enjoy the numerous blessings connected with, and derived from, established Protestantism. Be it therefore our care closely to study their writings, earnestly to pray for their spirit, which was none other than the spirit of holiness and truth ; and let us hold up to reprobation the men who would presume to set up a different type of theological excellence from that which, derived from them, the reformed church has handed to us.

I repeat, then, that the true remedy against the evil of false doctrine in the church is a profound respect for its standards.

And here let none glory in the concession, that there may be false doctrine held by those who are members of our church. What human power or wisdom could guard against this ? Who can contrive barriers which shall exclude the hypocrite or the pretender ? The church, indeed, were to blame if her system were lax ; if she had not established tests as to soundness of doctrine, and did not compel the candidates for her ministry to furnish all possible security for their moral and theological fitness ; but all this she has done, so that if inconsistent persons be within her pale, the reproach must be laid upon the corruption of human nature rather than on the church. She ordains none

to the sacred ministry who do not solemnly vow "that they trust that they are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon them that office and ministration. (*Form of "The ordering of Deacons."*) Not only so, she demands a certificate from three beneficed clergymen, that they have known the candidate for orders for three years last past, and believe him of holy life and conversation. Not only so, she causes to be publicly read in the church of the parish where the individual has been resident, a notice of his intended ordination, and calls or any who may know cause why he should not be ordained to state it. Besides all this, he is subjected to a most rigid examination as to his learning and doctrine, by the bishop's examiner; and at the time of his ordination the following form is gone through:—

"*The Archdeacon, or the person appointed in his stead, shall present them that are to receive the order of Priesthood, and say—*

"Reverend Father in God, I present unto you these persons present, to be admitted to the order of Priesthood.

"THE BISHOP.

"Take heed that the persons whom you present unto us be apt and meet for their learning and godly conversation, to exercise their ministry duly, to the honour of God and the edifying of his church.

"*The Archdeacon shall answer—*

"I have inquired of them, and also examined them, and find them so to be.

"*Then the Bishop shall say unto the people—*

"Good people, these are they whom we purpose, God willing, to receive this day into the holy office of priesthood: for, after due examination, we find not to the contrary, but that they be lawfully called to their functions and ministry, and that they be persons meet for the same. But if there be any of you who knoweth *any impediment*, or notable crime in any of them, for the which he ought not to be received into this holy ministry, let him come forth in the name of God, and show what that crime or impediment is.

"*And if any great crime or impediment be objected, the Bishop shall surcease from ordering that person, until such time as the party accused shall be found clear of that crime."*

What can be more strict than all this? All sorts of appeals are made, all sorts of tests applied, all sorts of investigation entered into, no pains neglected in order to secure competent and suitable characters. If, notwithstanding, heterodox or unworthy people unawares creep in, and the precautions of the church prove fruitless, it is not the system, but human depravity which is to blame. And here I may remark, that if the people were not dead or indifferent, no corruptions in high places could prevail to injure the church by the introduction of false professors. In a word, if our system were adequately worked out, and the people did their duty, we should soon see none but the truly worthy placed in positions of ecclesiastical power. Tractarianism, Arianism, or Unitarianism, would disappear from our borders, and it would be the glory of the church, that, not only in the desk, but in

the pulpit, the truth in its purest form was proclaimed. So long, however, as men exist in the church who cavil at its principles, or do not conform to its language, so long there will be weakness and division in the body. The Tractarians would charge Evangelical Churchmen with a schismatical spirit, and would exonerate themselves from the charge; they would have us to think that, because of their attention to the letter of rubrics, they are the champions of true churchmanship, although they are distinctly opposed to the spirit of our Liturgy and Homilies, and utterly protest against the letter of them, when that letter denounces Popery. Hence, with all their pretences, we are warranted to say, they are not good churchmen; how, then, can good churchmen be cordially united with them? How can their presence in the church fail to be productive of division?

And this is only a particular case; it applies, however, with equal force in every other. If men do not conform in principle, in language, in temper, and in tone to the standards of the church, is it any wonder that they should be viewed with coldness by those who do? How much more, then, if they make conformity with the church's rule a ground of offence, if they speak harshly of the man who takes up against Popery the language of the church, and acts towards it according to the example set by those whom she regards as her light and her glory!

The remedy, then, for division in the church, so far forth as it is connected with doctrine, lies in a strict and cordial agreement with the formularies of the church. Let there be habitually cultivated attachment to the language of the church; let the man be upheld who employs it; let no authority, however high, be regarded as a warrant for departing from the church's rule; let it be the exertion of those who wish well to society, to produce a state of public opinion precisely accordant with the mind of the church, and disposed to regard her tone as the very key of excellence; and thus there will be shut out and prevented those heart-burning dissensions, those painful divisions, through which the church is held up to her enemies as weak and contemptible.

2. The next cause of division in the church is, the corruption of the State.

The Church is united to the State, and the State has, in its possession, a considerable portion of the patronage of the church.

So long as the State was thoroughly Protestant—Protestant in its legislature—Protestant in all its functionaries, it was precisely conformed to the church, and its interests would have led it to select for high office in the church, the men who were most distinctly Protestant in their character. Statesmen holding their places through the prevalence of a Protestant opinion, would have been anxious to choose, for ecclesiastical preferment, those who would appear to have been most likely to cultivate in the public mind a high Protestant feeling.

All this, however, has been changed by the constitution of 1829. There has been introduced into the State a powerful influence which

is hostile to the church. Although Roman Catholics are deprived, by the Emancipation Bill, of the power of exercising church patronage, still the Minister of the day can scarcely exercise that patronage himself, without, to a certain extent, consulting the tastes and the feelings of his Roman Catholic colleagues, whether in the work of legislation or of government. The object of the Minister is to mitigate opposition, disarm hostility, and he must be anxious to avoid the annoyance that he would experience if taunted with the promotion of "violent partisans."

Hence there will be a tendency, on the part of all those who are the expectants of promotion, to chime in with the spirit of the times; thus they will stand aloof from their zealous brethren, they will pronounce the man "injudicious" and "rash" who speaks the language of the church. Is it not plain that division and weakness must be the result?

And, then, when men get seated on the episcopal throne, who owe their elevation to a Whig or a Radical government, either being, to a great extent, Popish—men pledged to a non-scriptural system of education, or to a system of politics which, however it might be called "liberal and enlightened," is any thing but decidedly Protestant: and when such prelates have in their hands the distribution of a large measure of patronage, how can they fail to present inducements to the expectant candidates for preferment to be low in their doctrinal views, and thus to stand separated from those of their brethren who cleave with firmness to their religious principles?

It may be said, that even during the times of Protestant ascendancy, the patronage of the church was corruptly exercised by governments, that nepotism, or favouritism, or political partisanship, were even then the grounds of preferment in the Church; and there is no reason why we may not admit, that, to a certain extent, this was so, but still there is an immensity of difference between the two cases. In the latter, it was human depravity which was at fault; in the case as it exists, the corruption is inherent in the system. In the former state of things favouritism must not necessarily have chosen a bad man; at the present day, the system renders very difficult the choice of a good one. In the former case, favouritism may have excluded the legitimate claimant; in the present case, legitimate claims are almost an insurmountable obstacle to success. There may be men of the very highest theological excellence, to promote whom would be to renounce political power, and to make the sacrifice with scarce a hope of its recovery.

Under such circumstances, it is anything but surprising that we should see division in the church. How can there be union between men, one of whom is looking, perhaps, to O'Connell, another to Lord Stanley, another to the Duke of Wellington, and another to some Whig prelate for his advancement? Will not every one of these laugh to scorn the individual who dreams of succeeding in his profession by the maintenance of the spirit which is suitable to it, or the performance of those Protestant duties which it imposes?

What, then, is the remedy for this crying evil? But two alternatives present themselves. Either separate Church and State; let the Government cease to have any influence in the appointment of bishops and other ecclesiastics; or else, on the other hand, introduce such a reform into the State, as shall make it once again a meet partner for the Church.

Now, the former alternative is revolutionary, and irrespectively of this, it is a course that could scarcely be justified on scriptural grounds. The latter alternative, therefore, alone remains; and hence it is our duty, with all our heart and soul, to throw ourselves into the work of producing such a reform in the State as shall deprive it of its malignant Popish bias, as shall render it again strictly Protestant.

It is to this work the Protestant Association has devoted itself. I am convinced that it is far from being an impracticable one. Let the united Protestants of the three kingdoms stand out in order to fix public attention upon the evils that have resulted from the compromise of Protestant principle in high places, and as this will be the fulfilment of sacred duty, they may expect that it will be providentially attended with a measure of success, which, perhaps, they could not naturally have calculated upon.

What a very important truth is conveyed in the fact, that the strongest ministry which England had seen for a great number of years, was utterly broken up the other day by a providential calamity! Irish potatoes proved to be, to a very great extent, infected with a disease. The intelligence was conveyed to Whitehall, and this simple fact broke up the ministry! Cabinets and governments are in countless ways the slaves of circumstances, and it is God who is the Ruler of these. A combination of events, all of which are under the control of Providence, sways public opinion with a potent influence; cabinets are overturned; united kingdoms fall asunder; empires are dismembered; strong parties are broken up, and those that are weak become invested with un hoped-for power. Let us, then, remembering that He holds in his hands our destinies, that He doth whatsoever pleaseth Him amid the armies of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth, be bold in enterprising great things, and leave the consequences to Him.

In effect, that which alone can produce unity is conformity with the common standard, the drinking into a common spirit; and whatever does not tend to promote a cordial devotion to that standard—whatever does not tend to lead an individual to see that conformity with that spirit is his interest, at the same time that it is his duty, is certain to militate against his zeal, and magnify his indifference. Instead, therefore, of aiming at the possession of the truth, considering *that* his sole object, and feeling that his interests will be furthered in proportion as truth is surely attained and zealously contended for; he will feel that his interests pull in a different direction from truth, and his opinions will be likely to be as various as there are degrees between truth and error. Now, when a society, such as the clergy constitute,

is operated on by a disturbing influence of the character here described, when each man is tempted to a certain measure of compromise in order to secure the favour of those who can extend his sphere of influence and improve his temporal condition; is it not obvious, that there is likely to result a vast amount of variation in opinion, and disagreement in view? The consequence will necessarily be, the absence of cordiality of feeling, the increase of disunion or division. Such, precisely, is the operation of the religious corruption, or to use an expression perhaps less offensive, of the admixture of heterogeneous religionists (each of them, from his rank, a sort of moral dynast,) which has been brought into the State. It is not now religious principle, but compromise in religion, that must be looked to as the mean, whereby a clergyman may expect to "get on" in the world; and the said result is, the disunion which we behold, with its miserable consequences of weakness, contempt, and overthrow. Can it, then, be doubted, that the remedy of the evil is the rectification of the State, and that the part of every true Christian is to seek to effect it?

3. *The third cause of internal divisions I stated to be want of Charity*—the absence of Christian love and trustfulness.

It may be, perhaps, not improper to remark that the sources of division which I have here described, involve, 1st, a want of faith; 2ndly, a want of hope; and 3rdly, of charity. False doctrine derives from deficiency of faith. This is intimately connected with, if it do not engender, a want of hope; it produces a sense of defective power, and thence, a disposition to suppose, that in an encounter with an enemy, nothing is to be hoped for beyond defeat. Had pure faith generated strong hope, the church never would have let go the constitutional bulwarks erected by our fathers; it would have laughed to scorn the threatenings of enemies, and felt confident of success in a struggle against them. When we recollect that such a confidence is heaven-descended, we need not be surprised that it operates under the divine blessing, and that it is certain to issue in success. And, 3rdly, it may be perhaps said that defective faith, issuing in unsound doctrine, taken in connexion with want of hope, originates that which I would next remark on, namely, want of charity; and this produces envyings, jealousies, emulations, wrath, strife, the lifting up of heart against heart, and brother against brother, with the same miserable result—weakness and division. From this source arises the spirit of clique and party that has split up the Protestants of Ireland into almost as many sections as there are individuals who can pretend to exert an influence upon their petty circles.

Selfishness is the natural result of want of Christian love. This principle of love, it is, which binds the whole church together in the bonds of cordial fraternity and holy friendship, which makes each man seek not his own, but every man another's wealth, (1 Cor. x. 24.) which exhibits Christians as actuated by the apostle's precept, and in "honour preferring one another." (Rom. xii. 10.) Where this is not the practice acted on, there cannot be union. We are to render unto all "their

dues," and every man has a claim to due respect. If this be refused he has a right to complain, a reason to suppose himself wronged; and when this vents itself, it will be in the language of annoyance and discontent, bringing down upon the church the reproach of weakness and division.

A consideration of the proper remedy for this evil, when it has intruded, and for the prevention of its existence at all, will lead to a more accurate understanding of its nature and character.

At such a time as this, in such a country as Ireland, and amid such a community as that of Irish Protestants, the form which public exertion takes, is necessarily that of association. "Many hands make light work;" "Every little makes a mickle," and a thousand such vulgar proverbs, mark the common sense of mankind as to the importance of combination where strength is required. Though we may be individually weak, united with our brethren we may compose a body that is strong, and calculated to produce great results. Hence, when great results are looked for, association is the instrumentality looked to. Now here is the place for selfishness. The selfish individual perceives in the occasion for public exertion, an opportunity for his own aggrandisement, a mean for the indulgence of his self-love; and, accordingly, under the pretence of some public exigency, he makes a great noise about patriotism, or humanity, or religion, his country, his brethren, or the church; puts forward great exertions, exhibits great ability, lays claim to a character for huge philanthropy, an immense measure of Christian charity, while all the time with him the centre of motion and the spring of action, are one single thing, namely, self. He appeals to the benevolence of the public, he expatiates on the claims of humanity, he puffs and he blows, he succeeds in attracting the attention of the community, he puts into the treasury of his organisation a large "rent," and then, does he put it into his own pocket? No, Heaven forbid! Were he capable of pecculation of that sort, he could not command the influence which is the object of his ambition; he has no feelings of the kind; a paltry, pecuniary advantage he would not descend to contemplate; his integrity is unblemished, his trustworthiness unquestionable; but he acts the part of my Lady Bountiful, or of Sir John, of patron-in-chief of all the distressed and the necessitous; he dispenses a secretaryship to one, a portership to another, a lectureship to a third, a doctorship to a fourth, a tutorship to a fifth; and he is gratified by beholding, like callow birds in a nest, with their mouths open and their necks upstretched, a whole army of hungry expectants, glorifying the skill with which he can command public sympathy and public contributions, and reward every man who is willing to bow down and render humble allegiance to the self-created idol.

But he can do more than this; he can not only promote, but exclude. He can create a little public of his own, to counteract, if possible, the decisions of the public in general; and by the skilful handling of the names of a few manageable patrons, noblemen and others, appear to

brand disparagement upon individuals whom he may regard as rivals. Now, since it is quite obvious that all this obliquity of view may be connected with exertions undeniably excellent, and calculated to be exceedingly useful, and that it cannot possibly exist without engendering feelings of pride and vanity on the one hand, of wrong and injury on the other; and, without totally defiling the nature of the service rendered, so far as a heart-seeing God is concerned, how exceedingly careful should those who mix themselves up in public exertions be, to keep their motives clear, and to allow no precaution to be neglected which may cause every individual concerned to understand that there is no foul play in the business, no abuse of the sacred names of religion and humanity, for the purposes of selfish aggrandisement or the promotion of personal glory. "If a man strive for masteries, yet is he not crowned unless he strive lawfully." (2 Tim. ii. 5.) If men "preach Christ, even of envy and strife," "of contention and not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to" a brother's "bonds," it is our duty therein to "rejoice, yea and we will rejoice." (Philippians i. 15—18.) Still, though grace working in us may thus constrain, we cannot but feel that the ties of affection are unbound, the cordialities of brotherhood banished, and room for division created. In one word, in all associations for Protestant purposes there should be a careful attention to afford no just ground of complaint to any one. Every Protestant has an interest, direct or indirect, greater or less, in every general Protestant movement; and he should, unquestionably, be allowed a fair opportunity of representing that interest. Thus the general sympathy is obtained, occasion for objection done away, and individuals deprived of grounds of complaint, or even of cavil. Such considerations as these cause me to regard with great satisfaction, the mode in which the Protestant Association of Dublin has attained its present strength. Previously to its establishment a few friends consulted together as to the desirableness of originating a general movement, in order to procure the re-adoption of the principles of truth in high places. At the request of these individuals a lecture, with open doors, was delivered in the Merchants' Hall, explaining the necessity for exertion and the nature of that which was called for by the times. That lecture was delivered by the author of the present work, and he suggested that as an eminent clergyman was president of the Protestant Association in Liverpool, and another in Manchester, so the presidency of the Dublin organisation should be offered to a brother clergyman, who had long occupied a very prominent position in the public eye; that a requisition conceived in the most affectionate terms and signed by those who took an interest in the contemplated movement, should be presented to this beloved brother. Such a requisition was accordingly prepared, very extensively and respectably signed, and I called upon him to make known the circumstance, and to request the appointment of a time when a deputation might wait upon him to present it. He emphatically, though kindly and respectfully, expressed the impossibility of his compliance; and suggested that, under the circumstances,

it were better that the requisition should not be presented; a suggestion which for very obvious reasons was acted on. I was, myself, then requested to occupy the post, but apprehensive of creating a feeling of jealousy, as well as for other reasons, I declined, and it was ultimately judged best that we should proceed without giving singular prominence to any individual.

A plan of operation being therefore concluded on, and a form of society chosen, a public meeting of all Protestants was called by requisition, and was held in the Merchants' Hall, on Friday, the 23rd of April, 1841. On this occasion, also, the doors were thrown wide open, and admission was refused to no one. A considerable number of clergy attended, and a series of resolutions were passed constituting the Association. The second resolution thus developed the principles of the body:—That the object of this Association shall be to endeavour, with the divine blessing, to arouse the dormant spirit of Protestantism amongst the working-classes of this city, and to impress upon all the necessity of using every lawful exertion to resist the encroachments of the Church of Rome, and in a Christian spirit to endeavour to convince the members of that church of the dangerous errors and soul-destroying principles of their system, and of the life-giving efficacy of Protestant truth." A committee was then and there chosen, which comprised all the clergy present, and by a standing law of the Association, which has always been in force, every clerical subscriber is entitled to attend and vote at the meetings of the committee. The most careful attention has been constantly given, to guard against the spirit of clique or party. To the general meetings of the body on important occasions invitations are issued, in the distribution of which there is a jealous anxiety to avoid neglecting individuals because of private pique or party animosity. I feel myself warranted to say, that the one single wish of the whole body is to unite *all* Protestants together, to exclude none, to bury the recollection of dissensions or disagreements, and to make the governing spirit and guide of the Association sound Protestant feeling and Protestant principle, both of the highest tone and character. At first the Association was denominated "Operative," because it was felt that there had not been present at its formation an adequate representation of the higher ranks, and therefore it was judged more honest, correct, and proper to take an humbler name, than to misrepresent as general that which could scarcely be so denominated. But as the Association grew and drafted into it members and supporters from every rank, and when it was found that the exclusive name caused some to stand aloof, or at least afforded them an excuse for doing so, it was judged proper to give the body a general denomination. As this, however, was felt to be a step that might seem to compromise the Protestants of Dublin, these were all particularly invited to attend a special general meeting of the Association on the 21st of August, 1845, at which meeting all persons who might feel themselves concerned in the step were allowed to express their sentiments; the exclusive term was abandoned on

that occasion, and the denomination of the body generalised. I cannot conceive a fairer mode of constructing a body to express the Protestant opinions of the Irish metropolis. Here there has been manifested an anxious desire to avoid the creation of division—to steer clear of offering offence or slight to any person or any party; and I feel convinced that until a similar rule govern every Protestant movement, there will be disaffection and disgust in our body, and as the result, disunion and its accompanying weakness.

It will, perhaps, be thought not unimportant at such a time as this, when vast exertions are demanded at the hands of Protestants, to have opened a discussion as to the nature of legitimate public movement. The Protestants of Ireland, and indeed of the United Kingdom, were for a long time so securely hedged in by their legal privileges that the necessity for confederation was not laid upon them. The system of aggressive agitation that has been kept up by their adversaries has rendered those adversaries adepts in the art. From this they derive no small advantage. It is essentially requisite that we should begin to learn not merely the principles of the warfare which we should carry on, and the objects for which we should contend, but the mode in which we should maintain the contest. If, while we assail the enemy, we create divisions in our own body, we shall with one hand be undoing the good which we are endeavouring to effect with the other.

It has been lately stated by a person of very great pretensions to authority, that all interference of the people with religious questions, when such interference is conducted irrespectively of the ecclesiastical authorities, is wrong; that it involves an *imperium in imperio*, and is schismatical in its nature. I trust, however, that it will be a very long while before the Protestant public gives its assent, or anything like its assent, to such a principle. It would bring us back to Popish bondage; it would amount to a relinquishment of our most cherished liberties. Why, what is our whole social system but one of *imperia in imperies*? The aristocracy constitutes an *imperium* within the *imperio* of the monarchy; the same may be said of the Commons with respect to the Lords; and the disfranchised people, the masses possessing their privileges of petition and remonstrance, and others of a highly-valuable nature constitute a great *imperium* in the midst of each of the other *imperies*. It is by mutual check and counter-check that the whole system works on so well. The general good imperatively demands the free expression of sentiment on the part of the various sections of society, and he that would impede it shows that he but little appreciates the most important elements in the imperial greatness of Britain. The essence of true religion consists in a divine influence upon the soul conferring upon all true Christians wisdom and knowledge on moral subjects. The free expression of such wisdom and such knowledge is highly calculated to subserve the public good. Instead, therefore, of throwing impediments in its way, let it be our object to facilitate it, and to make the codes, as well of law as of equity, which

should govern the construction and working of public bodies, plain and common, in order that thereby public opinion may be rectified, pressing evils done away, and the general happiness promoted by the prevalence of justice and of truth.

"The lion and the unicorn fighting for the crown,
Up starts the little dog and knocks them all down."

Such is the rhyme of the nursery upon the royal arms of England, and a very lively picture of those arms it presents. Query: Are not those arms a symbolical representation of our constitution? I know nothing at all about heraldry—the principles which have originated it, or the laws which govern it; it does not, however, require learning of any sort to see, if not a designed symbolical representation of moral principles in this heraldic device, something very like it.

The Crown is the great object brought before the mind's eye. It has two supporters; the first, the unchained British lion, whose strength is lodged in its huge powers, its vast energy. Here we have the people. They are untrammelled by conventionalities, their power derives not from the weapons that they wield, but from the might of their own hands, and the thunders of their roar. The second supporter is the unicorn. Grace and beauty display themselves in its form. Without the strength of its compeer, as far as it regards brute force, the swiftness of motion of which it is capable, and the formidable horn in its forehead, invest it with, perhaps, scarcely less power. This is the aristocracy. The very nature of the beast is rich; its hoofs and horn are silver, and mark the splendid coronet which encircles the neck; but what seems its object? To hold a chain which binds its wearer to the throne. Trammels that cannot be shaken off, connected with the very splendour of their position, impede the liberty of the nobles. To their rank and station there are affixed forms of the most stringent character. But what do we see? The lion even on the crown itself! Would it not appear to indicate the sovereignty of public opinion? Whatever may be the merits of this application, it is a truth unquestionable, that a prime consideration is due to the sense of the community—of the masses.

Here, in Ireland, for example, what would the Protestant gentry be without the people? Do they imagine for a single moment, that if the British government became convinced of the fact, that there was no commanding Protestant power in Ireland, no Protestant population, that, in fact, the Protestants of Ireland consisted in a staff of landholders, noblemen, and gentlemen—do the gentry imagine, I say, that if this were the case, the government would hesitate one single moment to grant every demand that O'Connell could make, to knock down the church, to establish Popery—aye, and to distribute the green acres among the O'Rourke's and O'Flaherties? If they imagine any thing different, they never entertained a more vain imagination in the whole course of their existence. The might of Protestantism in

Ireland, under God, rests in the people; and expediency no less than principle, propriety not less than the necessities of the case, should render it essential that those who would move in the furtherance of the Protestant cause, or for the support of Protestant interests, should pay a great deference to the wishes, the feelings, the principles, the opinions, nay, to the prejudices of the people. If this be not done, jealousies and disgust will be certain to spring up—division and weakness to be the consequences. There must be no lifting up of one above another; there must be no paltry partialities; there must be no drawing-room exclusiveness; there must be no saying, "We will have no Orange ribbons, no Orange lilies, no Kentish fire!" All such stuff as this is an encroachment on popular prerogative. These men would shave the lion, and make him "roar you as gently as any sucking dove." The spirit of clique and party is odious and insufferable; it involves a distinct absence of Christian charity, and cannot be sufficiently deprecated. In order, then, that there may be perfect unanimity among Protestants, let every man—every section of men—every Protestant party, have fair play. What was it that overturned the dynasty of King Saul? It was paltry jealousy; perhaps I should rather say, malignant envy. "'Saul hath slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands,' and what can he have more but the kingdom? And Saul eyed David from that day and forward." (1 Sam. xviii. 9.) Sure I am that all sections of the Protestant public are deserving of trust and confidence; in proportion, therefore, as they feel this, will they feel wounded at any hesitation that may be evinced in the concession of it.

CHAPTER VII.

WHAT IS TO BE DONE—THE DEVELOPMENT OF OUR PRINCIPLE.

Thus, reader, I have cleared the way.

You now know what Popery is. In point of doctrine, it is Apostasy. In point of position in our country, it constitutes a schism.

You now know what our church is. It is the true Catholic and Apostolic Church of Ireland. You see how our divisions may be healed. You perceive that if scope were given to the gifts of the laity within the church, the occasion for separation would be done away, the sources of division would be dried up, and all Protestants soon would have not only one spirit, but form one body. You likewise understand the means whereby the divisions that exist within ourselves may be banished.

Well, what is the conclusion of the whole matter? It is this—

You shall join me in the struggle that I am carrying on, in order to have the sound views which I have laid down practically acted on and carried out, both in Church and State.

You perceive that there never was a nobler cause than that which is committed to us ; we have in every thing truth on our side.

Our church is the true church, the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of Ireland, planted by St. Patrick, and by the grace and power of God preserved unto the present day. The church has been horribly plundered—its property vilely squandered. Proper efforts alone are necessary to procure restitution and to disperse the den of thieves who gorge and batten upon the spoils.

An Act of Parliament, to be sure, warrants the robbery, nay, has incorporated the robbers for the purpose of its perpetration. Hence, it cannot be designated *crime*, nor visited as such ; but, in the sight of Heaven, the deeds of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners are iniquitous, and under the guilt of their iniquity the nation lies.

What, then, are we to do ?

We are incessantly to proclaim to the State, in the ears of the Queen and of our legislators, that being united with the church, it is their primary duty to work out the principles of the church ; that Popery is the source of all the evils of Ireland, that Protestantism effectually carried out would remove those evils. We are to call upon them to act consistently with the principles of the religion which they have established, and to aid the church in the work of teaching down, preaching down, and proclaiming down, Popery. We are to point out to them the principles which they have themselves taught us, and to demand that they will either act on them, or relinquish a union that they are unfit for, and cease to corrupt the church. Hear how the church herself speaks with respect to the duty of Christian rulers—

“ It is written in the Book of Numbers, the 23rd chapter, that there was no idol in Jacob, that there was no image seen in Israel, and that the Lord God was with the people. Where note, that the true Israelites, that is, the people of God, have no images among them, but that God was with them, and that, therefore, their enemies cannot hurt them, as appeareth in the process of that chapter. And as concerning images already set up, thus saith the Lord in Deuteronomy, ‘ Overturn their altars and break them to pieces, cut down their groves, burn their images, for thou art an holy people unto the Lord ; ’ (Deuteronomy, vii. 12) ; and the same is repeated more vehemently again in the twelfth chapter of the same book. Here note what the people of God ought to do to images where they find them. But lest any private persons, upon colour of destroying images, should make any stir or disturbance in the commonwealth, it must always be remembered, that the redress of such public enormities pertaineth to the magistrates and such as be in authority only, and not to private persons : and, therefore, the good kings of Juda—Aza, Hezekiah,

Josaphat, and Josias—are highly commended for the breaking down and destroying of the altars, idols, and images, (1 Kings xv., 2 Chronicles xiv., xv., xxxi.,) and the Scriptures declare that they specially in that point did that which was right before the Lord. And, contrariwise, Jeroboam, Achab, Joas, and other princes, which either set up or suffered such altars or images undestroyed, are by the Word of God reported to have done evil before the Lord. And if any, contrary to the commandment of the Lord, will needs set up such altars or images, or suffer them undestroyed amongst them, the Lord himself threateneth in the 1st chapter of the Book of Numbers, and by his holy prophets Ezekiel, Micah, and Habakkuk, that he will come himself and pull them down." (Numbers i., Micah i., Habakkuk ii.) And how he will handle, punish, and destroy the people that so set up, or suffer such altars, images, or idols undestroyed, he denounceth by his prophet Ezekiel in this manner: 'I myself,' saith the Lord, 'will bring a sword over you to destroy your high places: I will cast down your altars, and break down your images; your slain men will I lay before your gods, and the dead carcasses of the children of Israel will I cast before their idols; your bones will I strew round about your altars and dwelling places, your cities shall be desolate, the hill chapels laid waste, your altars destroyed and broken, your gods cast down and taken away, your temples laid even with the ground, your own works clean rooted out, your slain men shall lie amongst you that ye may learn to know how that I am the Lord,' and so forth to the chapter's end, worthy with diligence to be read; that they that be near shall be far off with the pestilence; they perish with the sword, they that flee into holds or wildernesses with hunger; and if any be yet left, that they shall be carried away prisoners to servitude and bondage. So that if either the multitude or plainness of the places might make us to understand, or the earnest charge that God giveth in the said place move us to regard, or the horrible plagues, punishments, and dreadful destruction threatened to such worshippers of images or idols, setters up or maintainers of them, might engender any fear in our hearts, we would once leave and forsake this wickedness, being in the Lord's sight so great an offence and abomination. Infinite places almost might be brought out of the Scriptures of the Old Testament concerning this matter, but these few, at this time, shall serve for all.

"You will say, peradventure, these things pertain to the Jews; what have we to do with them? Indeed they pertain no less to us Christians than to them."—*Homily on Peril of Idolatry.*

I entreat attention to the principle set forth in this passage. Mark, well! it states, first, that the destruction of Idolatry is the duty of the people; "'Overturn their altars and break them to pieces, burn their images; for thou art an holy people unto the Lord.'" (Deut. vii.) Here note *what the people of God* ought to do to images where they find them." Thus does this State document, beyond any manner of doubt or misapprehension, lay down before us the duty of Christian

people with respect to idolatry. Now, I shall not insist upon the verbal or literal interpretation ; I shall not say that we are, *vi et armis*, to enter into Popish chapels, and proceed with our own hands to the destruction of idols and images. But I will take the spiritual interpretation, and I will say, that this passage renders imperative upon us the utterance of loud, decided, and uncompromising protest against Popish idolatry, in all places where it is perpetrated, and both in season and out of season. This at the very least it does. I will not take upon me to say that it does not warrant a great deal more ; but so far its warrant most assuredly goes. To denounce Popish idolatry in meetings, in publications, by placards, and, when Providence makes it proper, *vivâ voce*, too, in the ears of those whom it may concern, this, as we are here taught, is Christian duty. We are informed further, in the *second place*, that, inasmuch as the performance of this duty may be more effectually, and in a more orderly manner, accomplished by the government, they should accordingly take it up. Now, if the government fulfilled this duty, Popery, beyond any manner of doubt, would speedily perish out of Ireland. To illustrate what I say, suppose the following proclamation issued by the Queen :—



A PROCLAMATION.

VICTORIA R.

Being by God's ordinance, according to our just title, Defender of the Faith, and Supreme Governor of the Church, within these our dominions, WE hold it most agreeable to this our royal office, and our own religious zeal, to maintain the people committed to our charge in unity of true religion, and not to suffer them, without our princely admonition, to be led astray from the truth that can save their souls, into the vain delusions, dangerous errors, and foul idolatries of the apostate Church of Rome, which not only lead them away from Christ their only Saviour, but nourish faction both in the Church and Commonwealth, We have, therefore, upon mature deliberation, and with the advice of so many of our Bishops as might conveniently be called together, thought fit to make the declaration following :—

That the Articles of the Church of England, which have been allowed and authorised heretofore, and which our Clergy generally have subscribed unto, do contain the true doctrine of the Church of England, agreeable to God's Word ; that these Articles declare that "the sacrifices of masses are blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits," and that "the offering of Christ once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole

world, both original and actual, and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone;" (Art. xxxi.;) that "the cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay people; for both the parts of the Lord's Sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike;" (Art. xxx.;) that "transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of bread and wine in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions;" (Art. xxviii.;) that "the Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration as well of Images as of Relics, and also invocation of Saints, is a foul thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God;" (Art. xxii.;) that "the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith;" (Art. xix.;) that "the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of Great Britain and Ireland." (Art. xxxvii.)

On these grounds, We do hereby warn and admonish all our loving subjects, and more especially the natives and inhabitants of our kingdom of Ireland, to withdraw themselves from the ministrations of the Popish priests, schismatically intruding into that kingdom for the distraction of the minds of our loving subjects, the propagation of the blasphemies of the great Roman Antichrist, and of the destructive idolatries by him maintained and sent abroad; and We do exhort them to come for instruction to the learned ministers of the Church of Ireland, whose duty it is to explode the errors by which any of our loving subjects in Ireland may, through Popish schismatics, be beguiled, and to establish and confirm them in Christian truth.

Grievous as those errors are, and pernicious in their consequences, inasmuch as they may, through human weakness and infirmity, have taken hold upon the conscience of many of our loving subjects, We deem ourselves not called upon absolutely to prohibit the schismatical and heretical Romish services within our dominions. It is our royal wish that the rights of conscience in religious matters should be respected, even when the conclusions that govern conscience are erroneous, still we do hold it a paramount duty, at least to denounce Apostasy, Heresy, and Schism, and to warn all those whom they may lead astray, of their pernicious nature, character, and consequences.

On the premises we do, as aforesaid, hereby call upon all our loving subjects in Ireland, to abandon the apostate and schismatical Church of Rome, and attach themselves to the Ancient, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church of Ireland, with the Catholic Church of England by law united and incorporate.

Given at our court, at St. James's, in the ninth year of our reign.

What should hinder the publication of such a royal proclamation as the above? Indeed, much of it is in the very words of the Royal proclamations which will be found prefixed to the articles in the Book

of Common Prayer. Could the military be better employed than in holding such a document inviolate on Sundays and holidays, before the door of every Popish chapel in Ireland? If this were done, soon would the assassination of our gentry cease; soon would life and property be secure in Ireland; soon would the idols be flung to the moles and to the bats, the clouds of Popish darkness flee away, and happiness be found within every cottage in the land. I design the above, however, as a mere specimen of the legitimate working out of the church and state principle. Why should we not have *didactic* proclamations? If they were proper at the era of the Reformation, why not now? The Roman Catholics of Ireland would hear them—they would require their priests to answer them, they would perceive their inability to do so, and they would, by God's grace, abandon Popish idolatry, error, and apostasy. Why not didactic acts of parliament? Acts of parliament and proclamations inculcating truth, exposing and denouncing error? I repeat the question,—in God's name, why not? Parliament warrants and commands announcements as to railroads, turnpike-roads, highroads, and byeroads, should it condescend to such comparatively indifferent subjects, and see, without an effort to counteract the evil, a whole nation led blindfold by apostate priests in the broad road that leadeth to destruction. Such a didactic act of parliament in part is the 13th of the 28th of Henry the Eighth, which is as follows:—

“*An Act against the Authority of the Bishop of Rome.* Rot. Parl. cap. 23.

FORASMUCH, as notwithstanding the good and wholesome laws, ordinances, and statutes heretofore made, enacted, and established by the King's highness, our most gracious Sovereign Lord, and by the whole consent of this high court of Parliament, for the extirpation, abolition, and extinguishment out of this land of the pretended power and usurped authority of the Bishop of Rome (by some called the Pope) used within the same, which did obfuscate and wrest God's Holy Word and Testament a long season from the spiritual and true meaning thereof to his worldly and carnal affection, as pomp, glory, avarice, ambition, and tyranny, covering and shadowing the same with his human and crafty devices, traditions, and inventions set forth under the cloak of virtue, only to promote and establish his dominion as well both upon the souls and bodies as also upon the temporal goods of all Christian people, *excluding not only Christ out of his kingdom and rule of man's soul as much as they might, but also other temporal Kings and Princes out of their dominions, which they ought to have by God's law, upon the bodies and goods of their subjects, whereby he did not only rob the King's Majesty, being only the supreme head of the realm of England, and of this his land of Ireland immediately under God, of his honor, right, and pre-eminence due unto him by the law of God, but also spoiled this his land of Ireland yearly of innumerable treasure, and besides the losses of the same, deceived the King's loving and obedient subjects, persuading to them by his laws, bulls, and other his deceivable means, such as dreams, vanities, and fantasies, as by the same many of them were seduced and conveyed unto superstitious and erroneous opinions, so that the King's Majesty, the Lords spiritual and temporal, and the Commons, in this land being overwearied and fatigued with the experience of the infinite abominations and mischief proceeding of his impostures and crafty coloured deceits, to the great damages of souls, bodies, and goods, were forced of necessity for the public weal of this land to exclude that foreign pretended power, jurisdiction, and authority used and usurped within this said land, and to devise such remedies for their relief in the same as doth not only redound to the*

honour of God, the high praise and advancement of the King's Majesty, and of this his land, but also to the great and estimable utility of the same: which said good and wholesome laws notwithstanding, so made and heretofore established, it is come to the knowledge of the King's Highness, and also to divers and many of his loving, faithful, and obedient subjects, how that divers seditious and contentious persons, being imps of the said Bishop of Rome, and of his see, and in heart members of his pretended monarchy, do in covers and elsewhere, as they dare, whisper, inculcate, preach, and persuade, and from time to time instil, into the ears and heads of the poor, simple, and unlearned people, the advancement and continuance of the said bishop's fained and pretended authority, *pretending the same to have its ground and original of God's law*, whereby the opinions of many be suspended, their judgments corrupted and deceived, and diversity in opinions augmented and increased, *to the great displeasure of Almighty God*, the high discontentation of our said most dread sovereign Lord, *and the interruption of the unity, love, charity, concord, and agreement that ought to be in a Christian region and congregation*: for avoiding whereof and of all such seditious persons as be the means and authors of such inconveniences, be it enacted, ordained, and established, by the King our sovereign lord, and the Lords spiritual and temporal, and the Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by authority of the same, That if any person or persons dwelling, demurring, inhabiting, or resident within this land, of what estate, dignity, pre-eminence, order, degree, or condition soever he or they be, after the first day of November, which shall be in the year of our Lord God a thousand five hundred seven and thirty, shall by writing, cyphering, printing, preaching, or teaching, or by any deed or act, obstinately, or maliciously hold or stand with to extol, set forth, maintain, or defend the authority, jurisdiction, or power of the Bishop of Rome or of his see, heretofore claimed, used, or usurped within this land, or by any pretence obstinately or maliciously invent anything for the extolling, advancement, setting forth, maintenance, or defence of the same, or any part thereof, or by any pretence obstinately or maliciously attribute any manner of jurisdiction, authority, or pre-eminence to the said see of Rome, or to any bishop of the same see for the time being, within this land, that then every such person or persons so doing or offending, their aiders, assistants, comforters, abettors, procurers, maintainers, favourers, concealors, counsellors, and every of them, being thereof lawfully convicted according to the laws of this land, for every such default and offence shall incur and run into the dangers, penalties, pains, and forfeitures ordained and provided by the statute of provision and premunire made in the xvi. year of the reign of the noble and valiant Prince King Richard the Second, against such as attempt, procure, or make provision to the see of Rome or elsewhere, by any thing or things to the derogation or contrary to the prerogative royal, or jurisdiction of the crown and dignity of the realm of England, the laws, customs, and usages of this land."

I approve of every part of the above but the *penalty*. Let our Legislation, when the sanction of the law comes to be stated, run thus:—

"Be it therefore enacted, that a Board of Commissioners be appointed, whose duty it shall be to prepare wise and godly admonitions to the people, and such admonitions as shall be calculated to open their eyes to the delusions practised on them, and that these admonitions be promulgated in the form of proclamations and otherwise, as it may seem good to the same Board; and be it enacted, that they be supplied to the incumbents of the various parishes of Ireland, who shall have the same extensively posted, and otherwise distributed, through their various districts; and be it further enacted, that should any incumbent have reason to believe that the said godly admonitions, manifestoes, or proclamations, would be torn down or defaced by evil-disposed or Popishly-affected persons, in order that by such de-

facement the truth and substance of said admonitions should not reach and take hold on the minds and understandings of the people, that upon such incumbent going before the next magistrate, and making a declaration to the above effect, and claiming the assistance of the police or the military to preserve inviolate such admonitions or proclamations, at such times and places as they may be most likely to meet the view of her Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects, that such magistrate shall be bound to supply an adequate force for the aforesaid purpose," &c., &c.

Let there be no penalty on heresy—no punishment for Popery; but let there be an unflinching denunciation of every moral and spiritual evil.

I hereby submit a copy of an instrument directed to the Archbishop of Canterbury by the Privy Council in the reign of Edward the Sixth—

LETTER OF THE COUNCIL SENT TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY
FOR THE ABOLISHING OF IMAGES.

After our right hearty commendations to your good lordship: whereas, now of late, in the king's majesty's visitations, among other godly injunctions commanded to be generally observed through all parts of this his highness's realm, one was set forth for the taking down of all such images as had at any time been abused with pilgrimages, offerings, and censings; albeit, that this said injunction hath in many parts of this realm been quietly obeyed and executed, yet in many other places much strife hath arisen, and daily ariseth, and more and more increaseth, about the execution of the same; some men being so superstitious, or rather wilful, as they would, by their good will, retain all such images still, although they have been most manifestly abused. And in some places also the images which, by the said injunctions, were taken down, are now restored and set up again; and almost in every place is contention for images whether they have been abused or not. And while these men go on both sides, contending whether this or that image hath been offered unto, kissed, censured, or otherwise abused, proceedings have in some places taken place in such sort, as further inconveniences are like to ensue, if remedy be not found in time. Considering, therefore, that almost in no place of this realm is any sure quietness, but where all images are clean taken away, and pulled down already, to the intent that all contention in every part of the realm for this matter may be put down, and that the lively image of Christ should not contend with the dead images, which are things not necessary, and without which the churches of Christ continued most godly for many years, we have thought good to satisfy unto you, that his highness's pleasure, with the advice and consent of us, the lord protector and the rest of the council, is, that immediately upon the sight hereof, with as convenient diligence as you may, you shall not only give orders that all the images remaining in any church or chapel within your diocese, be removed and taken away, but also by your letters, signify unto the rest of the bishops within your province his highness's pleasure, for the like order to be given by them, and every one of them, within their several dioceses. And in the execution hereof, we require both you and the rest of said bishops to use such foresight, as that the same may be quietly done, with as good satisfaction of the people as may be. Thus fare your good lordship heartily well.

From Somerset-place, the 11th February, 1548.—*Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, Book 9.

Here is a most important document.

The case, however, of Roman Catholic chapels at the present day, is essentially distinct from that of those referred to. They were then connected with the State; their ministers were under the power of bishops who could be influenced, if not controlled, by the government; they

are now independent foundations. To pass a decree that the images which they contain should be dealt with in the above fashion, would, at least in point of equity, seem to be a questionable proceeding. But there can be no reason why the idolatry practised in them should not be *denounced*—why the people should not be warned against it. Such denunciation in these days would constitute as effectual a remedy as the destruction and removal of images constituted in those of Edward the Sixth. Let there be no interference with the right of reply; truth requires nothing but a free course for itself; its innate vigour is quite sufficient to make it, without the application of any violence, more than a match for error.

Such is the legislation that the evils of Ireland cry out for. Such is that which should consistently be promoted by a State united to the church as ours is, and such is that accordingly which Protestants should unite to petition for. It is quite obvious that Roman Catholics are not qualified for judging of the propriety of such laws; they cannot but be hostile to their enactment. Hence it follows, as an unquestionable consequence, that they should not, in *our* constitution, be admitted as members of the Legislature. It would be quite absurd to call their exclusion a grievance. It might as well be called a grievance to exclude Roman Catholic priests from being appointed as ministers in the Protestant church, as to exclude them from being legislators in a constitution in which the State, being united with the Protestant Church, is called upon to enact Protestant laws. I do not injure a man, nor oppress him, if I refuse to employ him as a gardener or a land-steward when I know, and when he knows himself, that the only art with which he is acquainted is shoemaking; or if I refuse to employ one as a writing-clerk, when he is competent to the fulfilment of no other function than that of a day-labourer. The analogy holds good all through the business of human life.

Let us, then, be consistent; let us carry out our constitution; and let all Protestants unite, in order to insist on this being done. I have not the least possible doubt, but if the Protestants of Ireland did this, they would succeed in their demands.

If the government positively determine to act inconsistently with the constitution, to treat all religions as alike, to make no distinction between truth and falsehood, between Protestantism and Popery, they should certainly renounce all connexion with the church. It is monstrous to say that men should have the appointment of our bishops, who are not animated with a lively zeal for the truth of our principles. It is a frightful thing to see a consideration for what Mr. O'Connell may think, or for what Mr. Hume may think, or for what Mr. Ward or any other enemy of the church may think, influencing the decision as to who may be our bishops, dignitaries, or other ministers. If the government be not animated by a paramount anxiety for the advancement of the best interests of the church,—and this they cannot be understood to be if they themselves be created by an influence which is even par-

tially hostile to the church,—in that case, they certainly are unfit to exercise a control over the church's interests, and reform is loudly called for. Should this be impossible, the separation of Church and State is the alternative. I hold it to be the duty of a Christian patriot, who should "not be given to change," to seek for the correction of the abuses which corrupt our system and impede its working, rather than for the revolution of that system itself. Hence it is, that I call for the consistent carrying out of old and acknowledged principles, rather than for the adoption of new ones.

Popery is a paramount evil; so it is described in the Word of God; as such it is spoken of by our church. No course of political conduct can be right that does not treat it accordingly. Can anything be more monstrous than the inculcation by law of principles that are false and antichristian—principles which, in their practical results, must be hostile to the peace, as they are inconsistent with the virtue, the honour, and the wisdom of a people?

Think of Sir James Graham, the other day, saying (as it is reported) in parliament, in terms that implied eulogy and involved the idea that Ireland was benefited by the circumstance that "the Roman Catholic religion possessed an unmarried clergy, who devoted much of their time to the assistance of the poor (hear)"; nay, why not "hear, hear, and loud cheers?" Surely, one cold "hear," after a slap at the "cormorant parsons," and their houses full of children, and, at the same time, a very handsome piece of blarney for the "self-denying" celibates, the "devoted" and "charitable" "unmarried clergy of the church of Rome," was a very poor allowance, and shows either that the house was disgracefully apathetic, or that the Jesuit reporter—for, be it understood, that the Jesuits take right good care to have the chief supply of this important department—forgot his cue, and neglected to put sufficient emphasis on the *consistent* language of the Home Secretary; think, I say, of Sir James Graham eulogising the celibacy of the Roman Catholic clergy! What, sir, a feature of the Popish system, on which God Almighty has entailed his curse, which he has placed on perpetual record as a dark character of that apostasy which is the very abomination that maketh desolate—this it is which you presume to make the subject of your praise!* The God of heaven informs us that he will pour down his vengeance upon the society where Popery prevails; that he will straiten the apostate community in every direction; that the curse shall be on their basket and on their store, upon their outgoing and upon their incoming, and upon every thing that they set their hand on for to do. (Deut. xxviii.) And yet here is a British minister, a professed Protestant, who recognises with approbation the mark of apostasy, and evidently supposes that the difference in expenditure which the political economists may determine to result from the support of a married and a bachelor priesthood, may constitute a counterpoise to the wrath of the Almighty. "The Lord will make thy plagues wonderful, and the plague of thy seed, even great plagues,

* See Appendix.

and of long continuance. Thou shalt carry much seed into the field, and shalt gather but little in. The Lord shall smite thee with pestilence, and with a fever, and with blasting, and with mildew; thine ox shall be slain before thine eyes, and thou shalt not eat thereof. The fruit of thy land, and all thy labour, shall a nation which thou knowest not eat up, and thou shalt be only oppressed and crushed away. And thou shalt grope at noonday, as the blind gropeth in darkness, and thou shalt not prosper in thy ways!" Thus saith the Lord. "Tush," saith Sir James Graham, "who cares for that? If the priests be idolaters in point of principle, still they are fakirs in point of practice; although they are apostates they are bachelors, and have plenty of spare coppers for the victims on whom they entail the indignation of an angry God!" Base and infatuated man! Blind and incompetent pretender to statesmanship! as if the silver and the gold were not the Lord's, and as if he could not give us enough and to spare in countless unthought-of ways, if we only had the grace to make his revealed will our law. Here is this wretchedly mistaken man, this grossly inconsistent person (why does he laud Popery, and continue attached to a system which anathematizes it? We could very well spare him in the church, and no doubt the demon-worshippers of England and Ireland would account him an acquisition), dreaming of economical advantages from a system which God denounces as untrue, apparently in ignorance that the honour of God is staked for the frustration of every advantage which such a system may pretend to involve. But I tell this blind guide, that the English population derive tenfold more advantages from the laborious, the virtuous, the high-minded clergy of the Protestant church, even in the narrow and contemptible view of political economy, than they ever would be likely to do from the residence of an unmarried clergy. The very necessities of married life that drive the clergy to schoolkeeping, or to the exercise of some other consistent employment, for the maintenance of their families, redound in results which are ten thousand fold more valuable to the community than all those results can be which the asceticism of an idolatrous apostate priesthood can possibly originate. Away, then, with apathy in opposing Popery! Let that man be accounted as no better than a traitor to his country and to his kind, who stands neutral, when a holy war—a moral warfare, is being carried on against Babylon the Great. I desire the employment of no weapon but truth. I would not injure a hair of the head of any Papist in Ireland; but I would denounce his system, and I would denounce it with vehemence and energy, and with an unflinching plainness, just in proportion as I felt alive to the best interests, both temporal and eternal, of my Roman Catholic countrymen. There can be no national happiness for Ireland until Popery is rooted out of it.

The fate of the empire, under God, is in the hands of the Protestants of Ireland.

I lament to say that there is a sad keeping-back of the assertion of the full demands of principle, on the part of the Protestant nobility

and gentry of Ireland. They seem disposed "to go softly." They talk in a shrinking tone, if they mention the subject at all, of Protestant ascendancy. What, then, is to be done? The masses of the Protestants of Ireland must "lift up their eyes to the hill from whence cometh their help;" their language must be, "Our help cometh from the Lord who hath made heaven and earth." (Ps. cxxi.) Let them stand forth in "that their might," (Judges vi. 14,) and they will be invincible. They constitute, if I may use the language, the pilot-power of the empire. What would the Protestant gentry of Ireland be without the masses? A staff of impracticables! The scorn of their enemies; the derision of the people of Great Britain! The Protestant nobility and gentry *must* take their stand with the people, when the people take their stand for truth. And when the Protestants of Ireland thus stand together, and advance for the claims that they make, the language of the Word of God and of the church, when they appeal to British Protestants in maintenance of scriptural truth, and in the allegation of that as the true source from which to look for national prosperity, they will evoke a spirit before which the strongest British minister that ever wielded the functions of his office must bend like a bulrush. Millions of the intelligent—of the wise and of the good, would start forth at a rallying cry from Ireland based on Protestant principle. They would be stimulated by recollections that would stir the very stones to mutiny. The fires of Smithfield, the blood of martyrs, the endurance of bondage, the possession of liberty, the horrors of tyranny, and the inappreciable blessings of constitutional freedom, the degradation of the realm when down-trodden by the Pope, and the glories of the empire being Protestant—all these would crowd upon their memories, and cause them to expel from power those who might favour Popery, and place in office good, and wise, and bold men, and, therefore, great and enlightened statesmen, before whose energy and faith, not merely the Irish difficulty, but every other difficulty of statesmanship, would disappear, the empire be set to rights, and Ireland become indeed

Great, glorious, and free;
First flower of the earth, and first gem of the sea.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED—RESULTS.

The question can scarcely be too often asked, What is it that we want? I answer, we want radical reform. All that has been hitherto done upon the constitution, has been alteration. We want reformation; and he will not be a faithful citizen of the State—he will not

deserve to enjoy the remnant of privilege which has been left to him, who will not become a genuine, true, and, in the best sense of the term, a radical reformer. Above all, the clergy must lead the way in this great work. For ever repudiated be the heresy that "religion has nothing to do with politics." So far from flying from the fulfilment of this department of duty, because the Roman Catholic priests have become stigmatised by the revolutionary influence that they have exerted upon the State, we must actually make them our models in everything but their object. In everything but their object, their example is imitable. I think I may really venture to say, that the salvation of the country is, under God, in the hands of the clergy. What conceivable power could resist the influence of the clergy if they did, one, and all,—bishops, priests, and deacons,—place themselves at the head of the people to demand radical reform. I know well the powerful influence which a statesman, high in office, can exert upon churchmen elevated in function. And in ordinary times, and under ordinary circumstances, it is rather hard to conceive how the tempting powers which such a statesman might exert on ecclesiastics of high pretension could be resisted. But neither are the times, nor the circumstances, in which our lot is cast of an ordinary character. The existence of the Empire is at stake; the happiness that once was the inmate of the homesteads of at least the protestant inhabitants of the United Kingdom, has well nigh fled; and it is frightful to contemplate at once the demoralisation and the misery which are prevalent.

What is the reason that so melancholy a condition of society should appal—should almost paralyse with apprehension and with dread forebodings, all those who have the welfare of the human family at heart? The reason is simply this: that we have not carried out our principle—the great Anglican principle of a united Church and State. The State makes a profession of religion and tramples on it. Is it possible to conceive that this should not produce general indifference to religious obligations? The prime minister puts his hand upon the sacred depository of our faith—the Gospels of God—he professes to believe them true; and that, at least, one great system which abounds amongst us, is blasphemous, idolatrous, and antichristian—what then? Why, then he confesses himself coerced by fear, and he exhibits himself under the influence of this coercion as utterly despising the pledge by which, in the face of the world, he is solemnly bound. What crime is it which such conduct on his part does not actually warrant? The robber, coerced by want, plunders his neighbour's goods; the murderer, coerced by fear, cuts his neighbour's throat; the adulterer, coerced by lust, indulges the clamorous propensities of a corrupt nature; may not each plead the example of his betters, and cheer himself with the consideration that if he can only escape the penalty of human law, he may rest perfectly easy as to the consideration that he has incurred the sanction attached to violated religious obligation? Should we feel in the least surprised that God Almighty should withdraw the restraining influences of his grace from indivi-

duals, when he sees the whole nation set at nought the duty which it professes to owe him?

Give us but radical reform—give us but the State fulfilling its function of providing for the moral and physical amelioration of the people, and it is impossible to doubt that we shall see a holy influence—a regenerating influence, conveying light, and knowledge, and piety—aye, and happiness, too, into the midst of every social circle.

If the titular “Archbishop of Tuam” be a repealer, why should not the genuine Archbishop of Armagh be a radical reformer?

I have spoken as to the bearing of Christian legislation upon the conversion of Ireland, but let it not be for one moment supposed that the influence of the policy which we must at once demand at the hands of statesmen, would be confined to Ireland. No; England is quite as much—nay, more likely to be benefited by that policy than Ireland is. Shall I venture an attempt at picturing what England would be if the English system was really developed? I have glanced at this more than once in the course of this work. Feeble as I feel my pen to be, I will again essay the interesting subject. Let me, then, rather narrow the bounds of view. Let me speak of English towns. I shall speak of any one of these towns. Let the mind of the reader apply to the population in general, what I shall say of one single town—say Manchester.

Every manufactory in Manchester, then, should and might be rendered, comparatively speaking, a sort of sanctuary. In some of these thousands of operatives, male and female, are employed.

The work of the day should be commenced among them by prayer and praise. If a short Scriptural exhortation were added, so much the better. What a delightful chorus would thus ascend from every such assemblage to heaven! What a blessed thing would it be to hear the sweet songs of Zion, hymns of praise, thus sent up from thousands of humble hearts to the throne of the Most High! What a sanctifying effect would such a course of conduct have on the mind of every individual!

Would it not be likely to draw the bonds of affection closely between masters and men? Might we not expect to see as the result of such a practice, jealousies of all sorts mitigated; liberality on the one side, and contentment on the other, going hand in hand; and each of the parties considering how he might best serve his neighbour?

Surely if the master of a simple domestic household think it right to gather together all the members of his family daily about the social altar, such duty cannot be considered as less imperative on masters, but the reverse, when they stand in a position where their servants are sometimes multiplied a thousandfold, and where the performance of it would be perhaps a thousandfold more interesting.

Nothing is more true than that the feeling attending every religious service grows in proportion to the numbers engaged in it. If there be only a few the service is likely to be in the lapse of time occasionally, hastily, or carelessly performed. To this sort of negligence there

is no such antidote as the presence of a multitude. I have no doubt that an important spiritual influence attends the exercise of singing hymns together. Now, this particular service is almost irksome, if the number be very small. It becomes delightful, refreshing, regenerating, really calculated to invigorate the soul, when a multitude is collected together. What a cheering thing would it be to the heart of the believer to hear in the manufacturing towns of England the morning sacrifice of praise sounding forth from thousands of honest hearts. Why might we not see a similar conclusion to the day's labour?

Certain difficulties connected with the commencement of such a blessed practice could easily be got over. The masters themselves, in the first instance, the clergy, or other suitable individuals might show the example. In a short time, if it were not always convenient for these to attend, we might expect that some pious workman would be raised up to lead the devotions. But the truth is, every great commercial establishment should have connected with it a chaplain—an earnest, right-headed, right-hearted, and wise man. His influence on the feelings, conduct, and habits of all employed, would well repay his salary.

Some perhaps might think that the sacrifice of half an hour every morning would be more than could be afforded with a proper regard to the interests of trade. But if those who are of this opinion, would consider what a saving of time, in hours and days also, would be the consequence of increased religious habits among the working classes generally, I think they would be likely to conclude, that at the end of the year time would be rather gained than lost. We might in fact expect to see, as the result of the practice here mentioned, the gradual amelioration of the people; increasing industry, soberness, and chastity; and the progressive growth of feelings of brotherly kindness.

Such a practice would be likely to carry its effects home to the humble family circle, and soon would it be felt that it is religion which truly confers wisdom, knowledge, and peace. In fact, society would become prepared for further steps towards the removal of abounding evils.

This would naturally lead to the diminution of the number of gin shops. It is the aboundings of iniquity which create, so far as it is objectionable, this line of business.

The Government instead of being paternal; instead of using all the spiritual means which connexion with the holy Catholic Church puts within its reach, of promoting religion among the people, according to the modern diabolic, hell-invented notion that it has nothing to say to religion, abandons the people to the influence of Popery, infidelity, and every other species of spiritual wickedness. Demoralisation increases; the earnings of the labouring class, instead of being devoted to the maintenance of their families, are too often ready to be lavished on any species of sin and wickedness. The profits derived from creditable callings diminish; the Government then comes forward to derive a revenue from the vice of the people. It licenses houses in which men may

indulge the most vicious propensity of their nature; it sets its seal to the legitimacy of a trade derived from the appetite for intoxication, and the proper channels of commerce being thus dried up, even well-disposed individuals are driven by the necessities of supporting their families into a sort of business that they cannot justify to themselves. But let the blessed spread of religious feeling work a reformation, and the appetite for sin will diminish. The appetite for legitimate comforts will increase, and the earnings of labour will be expended in procuring for the wife and children the conveniences, the comforts, or the ornaments of life. Houses of entertainment will very much diminish in number, in a great measure change their character; and shoemakers, tailors, hatters, weavers, straw-bonnet manufacturers, ribbon makers, calico printers, and so on, will be increased and multiplied in number.

Numerous, perhaps we might almost say innumerable, advantages will flow from the increased influence of religion. Amongst others we may state, I think, increased leisure; leisure that may be devoted to the cultivation of sound knowledge. When irreligion abounds, all the time that can possibly be spared is devoted to the purposes of sin. Thence arises illness; thence expense. The funds of the workman thus become diminished, both by the direct waste that attends on his conduct and the expenditure rendered necessary as its consequence. Every moment of sobriety and health is necessarily occupied in hard labour, in order to meet the mere demands of nature, not to say of extravagance, and no time whatsoever remains for the cultivation of the rational powers. Even the Sabbath, the blessed day of rest, is either squandered in sinful debauch, or used as a season of mere idleness to recruit exhausted nature. But under a new order of things, religion abounding, all these evils will be done away. The increase of every sort of business—the diminution of the insatiable demands of pride, avarice, or cupidity on all hands, both in the case of the employers and the employed, will allow men in less time to earn all that may be demanded for their support—opportunities for recreation and intellectual improvement will be multiplied, and society will grow in knowledge and civilisation. All the powers, and all the means of the parent will be employed in promoting the happiness of his family. The dear wife may be what Englishwomen are ever disposed to be, a pattern of neatness and elegance, and the little smiling “bairns,” the beautiful children, will be carefully educated in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Oh, happy times! Oh, blessed prospect! It will be then quite in vain for demagogue agitators to come abroad and tell the people that Ireland never can be happy until holy water, holy ashes, holy beads—now only think of holy beads, a blessed rosary, a holy toy!—that Ireland never can be happy, until holy beads, holy candles, and blessed palm, produce their unmitigated influence upon the people; it will be then quite in vain for learned lecturers to attempt to persuade the people that buffoonery and Bartholomew Fair frolics are needful to make men happy. The light will then shine bright and

clear; wisdom and knowledge and happiness will go hand in hand. I say it will be then quite in vain for demagogue agitators to come and tell the English people that "justice to Ireland" demands the surrender of Popish districts to the desolating influence of the priests of the great Apostasy; that nothing can serve our country but the overthrow of a church established to preach the pure Gospel, the support of which does not cost the people one single penny. This will be then quite in vain; the nonsense and folly of any such course of argument will appear as clear as the daylight. Oh, happy England! Oh, blessed, rescued, delivered Ireland, if we could see the state of things that I have described really existing in it!

The result of such a state of things further would be the gradual approximation of the ranks. We should see the pride that is inseparably connected with an elevated state of society, and the meanness that will be found abounding among the poor, when both are irreligious, or not properly religious,—for example, Popish or Infidel—we should see this pride and meanness completely pass away, and humbleness of mind, dignity of demeanour, Christian courtesy, and mutual respect, distinguishing all classes. The inseparable barriers that have divided society into castes, would be broken down; order, indeed, would be maintained; true nobility would not be evil spoken of; lowliness would not be despised; the high would be able to condescend without the apprehension of the approach of the insolent.

Who can refrain from exulting at the prospect of such a reform as this? Who can help saying, "Oh that thou wouldst rend the heavens and come down, and that the mountains might melt at thy presence! Rid me and deliver me, (it was a pious king that offered the petition—Take the wicked from before the queen, and the throne will be exalted in honour)—Rid me, and deliver me from the hand of strange children, whose mouth speaketh vanity, and their right hand is a right hand of falsehood, that our sons may be as plants grown up in their youth, that our daughters may be as corner-stones polished after the similitude of a palace, that our garners may be full, affording all manner of store; that our sheep may bring forth thousands and tens of thousands in our streets; that our oxen may be strong to labour, that there be no breaking in or going out; that there be no complaining in our streets. Happy is the people that is in such a case; yea, blessed is the people whose God is the Lord."

Crowds can be got together to clamour for "Justice to Ireland," which means the ascendancy of Popery in our country, and the perpetual prostration of its inhabitants—to clamour for "the Repeal of the Union," which means the same thing, the disruption of the empire to boot—to clamour for "Vote by Ballot," or the "Abolition of Church Rates," or the "Diminution of Taxes," or for the "Opening of the Ports," or for the "Charter," or for almost any other object that political fanatics, if I may so call them, set their hearts on. Among these crowds Popish priests and Dissenting ministers will take the lead. Why should not crowds of serious, earnest, downright deter-

mined Englishmen and Irishmen, both being Protestants, and headed by their clergy, come together to petition for "Bible Laws," and "Christian Parliaments," and a scriptural policy—in one word, for real "Radical Reform." Chartists and Repealers, Papists, Infidels, and Atheists cry out, "No Placemen! No Pensioners! No Clergy! No Church! No Union!" and so forth—let the real friends of society stand forward, headed by the clergy, and let their cry be "No wickedness! No sin! No Popery! No priestcraft! No delusion! No prevalent darkness, ignorance, and folly!" Let radical reformers of the right sort—humble Christian men, come together and make their speeches; I know hundreds that could do it well—to show how the spread of vital religion would bless the whole community—let them meet again, and again, and again, to make known their views, to explain their objects, to make their light shine before men, to make all understand the peace, the happiness, the blessedness, the universal tranquillity that would arise from a "radical reform," from the adoption of truly Christian legislation and the universal spread of truth, in one single phrase—from the development of the British system, and by degrees their sentiments will become diffused throughout the whole community. It will correct the public mind, it will form a sound public opinion, and those now "sitting in darkness will see a great light."

The Queen reads the newspapers; and so do the royal family; Queen Adelaide, Prince Albert, the Duchess of Kent; I dare say every soul of them knows well what Mr. O'Connell means by "repeal," and what others mean by the "Charter" and "Vote by Ballot;" I dare say they all have a tolerable notion of the views of those who advocate these measures—why might they not also be brought to see the views that we real radical reformers take on religious subjects? Why might not they by the speeches of humble, earnest men reported in the newspapers, be brought to understand that sin is the cause of all national sorrow, and that the only remedy for it is the spread of Gospel light; that Protestantism is the glory of England, and Popery the ruin of Ireland? to understand that the evils of England arise from the neglect of the English system; that those of Ireland spring from the very energy with which a false system is carried out? Why might they not have their attention forced to consider the advantages that would flow to the nation from having wisdom in our senators, and righteousness in our exactors? Why might they not thus be brought to learn, among other things, and above them all, their own spiritual necessities, as needy, dying creatures, and thence be brought to that cross, where they would find pardon and peace? I ask you, why might not all this be? Is there one single reason why it might not be? Not one single one in the whole world!

Then we have the bishops in Parliament. Blessed be God that they are there! Should we very much lament that they are assailed, persecuted, and vilified? Oh that they may be thus driven more closely to the throne of grace, may they there gain strength in the

inner man; may they be brought to see that temporal policy will not meet the exigencies of the time in which we live; may they be brought, like those holy Apostles, of whom they are the successors, to make a bold stand for truth, righteousness, and liberty, and to be in truth, as they are in law and in right, fathers in God! Let us make them hear the cry of the church; they will rejoice to hear it; most gladly will they respond to it; most ably will they stand forward to advocate the principles of holiness which right-minded men would urge upon the nation. What more happy circumstance could we have in our favour? They will themselves recognise the Word of God, when spoken by Christian people; and they have access to pour it into the Queen's ear.

In effect, if we be only brought to understand our principle and to be alive to its importance, we shall find that there are manifold ways of bringing it about. The elective franchise is a mighty instrument. Let us seek real, earnest men of power to stand up for truth in the Legislature; let us put little trust in mere politicians. The very worst sign of the times that have just passed was the confidence that was placed in the Duke of Wellington and Sir R. Peel. It indicated an obliquity of view, a want of simplicity and singleness of eye that was most deplorable. Thank God, the wretched, miserable, Conservative party is broken. Conservative, indeed! In the name of wonder what was there to "conserve?" Poverty, wretchedness, demoralisation, and Popery. No, we want reform—we want the eradication of our evils, and not their "conservation"—we wish to Christianise the country: there is sense in this; but as for those who hope to "conserve" it in a God and Belial state—help their heads! "I would thou wert hot or cold; but because thou art not hot or cold, but lukewarm, I will spue thee out of my mouth." Frogs! frogs! this is the age of frogs. Land and water; neither one thing nor the other; the eyes up to heaven, and the bellies swagging on the ground—croak, croak; and jump, jump, by fits and by starts, a slimy, filthy, disgusting, cowardly generation, and a great toad at their head, always retreating from the face of something feared. Let us eschew frogs and "Conservatives;" men who are neither one thing nor the other; neither Protestant nor Papist; "neither fish, nor flesh, nor good red herring."

In sum, what is wanted is a powerful Christian agitation—an agitation which shall contemplate the spread of truth, and point out the mode of its effectuation; and this under a deep conviction that nothing but the spread of truth can recover Great Britain, regenerate Ireland, and save the empire from ruin.

It will be understood that anything in the shape of religious penalty or coercion exerted by the State, is utterly out of the question. While its origin is Popish, it is utterly abhorrent to the Protestant character. We require measures to influence, not to coerce. What the character of those measures should be, I will reserve for another chapter.

CHAPTER IX.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED—MEASURES OF REFORM.

It is impossible to contemplate the progress of society in either Great Britain or Ireland, without coming to the conclusion that there is something radically wrong in the state of things that exists, and has long existed amongst us. In Ireland there is a gradual progress in idolatry and error; in Great Britain, in religious indifference and demoralisation; while, in both countries, wretchedness and misery are laying hold upon the masses. It would be lamentable indeed to view such a melancholy state of things, if we were obliged to admit that we had been acting consistently with our principles. But when we recollect that these principles have been absolutely abandoned—if not professedly, at least practically—we find some ground of consolation in our misery. Had all been wrong while we had been following out our principles, the obvious conclusion would be, that those principles themselves were wrong; and it would be wisdom at once to renounce them and adopt others. As it is, the obvious reason of the thing is to conclude that our evils have resulted from our negligence, and to determine that that shall be abandoned for ever.

We have totally departed from the very principle of legislation which, in past times, raised England to a pitch of national glory. Acts of British legislation in bye-gone days, gave us the authorised version of the Scriptures, provided for their circulation, regulated the liturgy, authorised the homilies, proclaimed amongst the masses the obligations and the blessings of religion and virtue, together with the criminality of vice and wickedness, and the curse which inevitably followed in their footsteps. Let those precedents be consulted which will be found embodied in this work, and we shall be compelled to allow that the Legislature in former times devoted itself to the moral elevation of the people, while it left in a great measure those arrangements which were connected with the mere material interests of the people, in the hands of the inhabitants of those localities especially affected by them. The direct reverse of this is the course at present followed. The work of elevating the national character is abandoned by the State. It is left to the precarious benevolence, philanthropy, or religious zeal of individuals, while the government seems disposed to centre in itself and in its officers the care of those subordinate interests which properly belong to peculiar districts. For example, here in Ireland, a board of ecclesiastical commissioners sitting in Dublin, has vested in it the care of all the paltry arrangements of all the churches in this country. The

provision of coals and candles; the expenses of laundry work and white washing, &c., &c., &c., for every little church, in every little nook and corner of the island, from Mullinahone to Magherafelt, belongs to those high functionaries; while in England, the "Three Kings of Somerset House" take cognisance of the water gruel and glauber salts which are considered necessary to preserve existence in the paupers of Cumberland and Cornwall. In fact, centralisation is the order of the day; and universal neglect the consequence. That which the government could gloriously effect, namely the production of an elevating effect on the community in general, it abandons; that which it is obviously unfitted for performing it takes out of the hands of those to whom it properly belongs, while its interference exasperates every local jealousy, and its inefficiency excites general loathing and contempt.

It is time that an end should be put to so preposterous a condition of affairs. Happily, I was going to say, perhaps unhappily would be a more proper form of speech—unhappily, then, things have arrived at such a pass that this mismanagement of the great interests of society is no longer tolerable. Things having almost come to the worst, we may peradventure hope that they will mend. The legislation of England, in past times, was of a religious character. Why should it not be so now? Society is groaning under the wretchedness springing from indifference to religious obligations, or under the darkness which arises from religious ignorance. Surely those causes are sufficiently afflictive in their consequences to call for the interference of a paternal government. The legislation of Popish countries, at the present day, is of a religious character. Shall we allow Protestantism to rest under the stigma of being indifferent to the highest concernment of mankind? The great functionaries of the State in Italy and Austria lend themselves to the promotion of priestcraft and idolatry; should the majesty of England refuse to be auxiliary to the spread of wisdom and of truth?

I have often elsewhere referred to a scene which took place in Austria. It was the celebration of high mass at Toplitz. I think it impossible to take a review of the occurrence without concluding that it was calculated to operate a powerful effect upon the general mind. That influence would tend to give greater efficacy to priestcraft; greater confirmation to tyranny; but why? Why, because the principle involved in the celebration was false, and the system, of which it was part and parcel, antichristian.

Let me, however, call the attention of the reader to the narrative of the affair derived from the *Morning Herald* of the day:—

As soon as the imperial party arrived, the Austrian band played the Russian National Anthem, and as they entered the square, the military presented arms, and the cannon gave a salute. Both the Empresses, and the Princess of Lignitz, (wife of the King of Prussia,) attended by all their courtly dames, took possession of the pavilion; and the princes, the knights, generals, and other officers ranged themselves

around them, while the Emperor of Austria, the Emperor of Russia, the King of Prussia, and Prince Metternich, advanced to the platform, and then the ceremony of High Mass was performed, the great personages being uncovered, and kneeling down at those parts where custom prescribes. The ceremony, like all those of the Roman Catholic Church, was most affecting; [to the ignorant and unenlightened, you should have said, friend, scribe! nothing can be "most affecting" to a wise man, which is based on falsehood and intended to delude the mind. The truth is my hearty, you here went beyond your commission. As a reporter, you were just to give facts. If you felt this particular scene "affecting," or "most affecting," you were warranted to say so; but to volunteer a testimonial to popery, as to the affecting character of "all" its ceremonials, was to show the cloven foot—to discover the Jesuit in disguise;] and what between the solemn chaunting of the priests, the smoke of the incense, and the salutation of the military, added to the grouping of the distinguished company, emperors and kings in the foreground; empresses, queens, princes, and princesses in the second line, and the still immense multitude in the rear, the mind was strongly impressed with the sublimity of the scene; and I am sure if one only considers the nature of divine worship [but recollect, good sir, it must be "*divine* worship," not popish trumpery] celebrated in the open air, with all the attendant pomp of several courts united, and the highest of human beings bowing down before the altar of God, and not a word heard but the solemn voice of the priest, with thousands uncovered all in silent prayer—I am sure my description will not be considered overcharged, particularly at the most sublime parts of the service, when the Host was elevated and every head bent, and the cannon sent forth flames, and the troops with their successive volleys honoured the Almighty Being, in whose name the sacrifice, as the Roman Catholics call it, was offered."

This would have been all right if Popery were not all wrong. Its tendency was to rivet the chains of a system that locked up the whole population in the thralldom of apostasy and ignorance. If, however, we conceive an analogous ceremony of which the reformed religion were the animating principle, I cannot but think that its tendency must be allowed to be altogether excellent. The very principle here carried out is popularly acted on amongst the Methodists. What else are their camp meetings, so usual in England? Are not the great open air meetings of all denominations in America similar in their nature? These have not been unfrequently characterised as fanatical. I need not be at the trouble of investigating the truth of the charge; for, whether true or not, it does not alter the matter, the meetings alluded to are held upon the principle that a popular influence of a religious nature is likely to result from great open air religious demonstrations. It strikes me that the Anglican church is the platform on which the principle might be carried out in a manner totally unobjectionable and highly salutary; in which there might be grandeur without vanity, and a powerful impression without fanaticism. Can it be possible that the monarch of England can lend the powerful impulse of her example to nothing more edifying than the opera, or promotive of the national interests of her people than the race course? Let us only set ourselves to the work, and we shall soon happily discover the difference. Let us organise ourselves to demand radical reform; let us set before our eyes the noble example of those Scottish worthies whose Christian patriotism I have put on record in the seventh chapter of the First Part

of this work ; let us, like them, call for Christian legislation, and soon shall we see the enthusiasm of the nation evoked, and that enthusiasm crowned with triumphant success.

To the effectuation of this glorious enterprise, there is primarily demanded the utter rejection of the wretched heresy that religion has nothing to do with politics. Let us see the clergy at the head of the people, and the result will be an agitation that will do more than save the empire—it will regenerate the population. It is almost scandalous that we should be obliged to go to popery for examples to teach us Protestant duty. But what has it been that has given efficacy to the agitation of O'Connell? This; that it was religious—essentially and always religious. He was carried forward on the shoulders of the bishops and the priests of his heresy. A religious agitation that would have the promotion of truth for its object, would take hold of the deepest affections of the people; it would soon enlist every individual in its ranks. There is none so base that he would not wish to be good; there is none so doltish as to be incapable of seeing that the general prevalence of true religion might possibly make him so.

Again, then, I cry, Hurrah! for radical reform!

Now, then, what are we to have? What are we to call for? What should a well disposed parliament do? What should a rightly animated people expect?

1st. A board of commissioners should be established, called "Her Majesty's Board of Commissioners for Regulating and Improving the Condition of the Working Classes," rendered necessary by the following evil, viz.:

The progress of invention and the improvements of machinery have greatly altered the field of labour—*altered*, but not diminished it; rather, indeed, otherwise. Should this state of things be deplored? The tide of knowledge, the march of improvement impeded? Certainly not. But, loving our neighbours as ourselves, should compel us to guard against the evils that are consequent upon it. If the "march of intellect" dry up one spring of supply, it opens another. The construction of railroads and the manufacture of machinery are every day creating, if I may so say, new trades—demanding new hands or a different application of old ones. But the disemployed poor do not know this; they know not where to apply for relief or direction; they see their families destitute, while they themselves, pining in hopeless want, are unable to afford them assistance. Let a board of commissioners—three or four honest hard working men—be appointed to see to this matter; to guide unoccupied hands to those places where occupation may be found, so that the demand which is every day arising may every day be supplied. These commissioners should have judgment to perceive where the improvement of machinery may throw hands out of employment without simultaneously creating equivalent labour elsewhere, if this should, indeed, at any time happen—and

in this case, under their instruction, the government should with a strong hand provide that what the Giver of every good gift intended for the general benefit, should not be made subservient to the mere aggrandisement of the covetous and the ambitious.

2nd. Let a board of commissioners be appointed, called "Her Majesty's board of commissioners for colonising waste lands." It is astonishing that this should be a subject so long disregarded. It is amazing to see the hundreds of thousands of acres, evidently improvable, which are left in Ireland, and England too, uncultivated; while hundreds of thousands of the population are shipped off to root out and burn up the wild forests of Canada, or to endure a miserable exile at Swan River, Van Diemen's Land, or Botany Bay. This truth struck me forcibly years ago, when I was resident in England; indeed, in that country more especially. From Sheffield to Manchester, for example, what a noble country! Staley-bridge, Oldham, Manchester itself! Is it not evident that these towns have been reclaimed from the wildernesses of moors that are around them? In the very midst of these moors extensive farms may be seen, through the spirited exertions of some industrious Englishman, in a high state of cultivation. And will any one tell me, that if proper pains were taken, the whole, with some slight exception, perhaps, might not be made similar? But surely, if one sees roses, and lilies, and beautiful cottages clad with woodbine, and distinguished for the elegance and neatness that are peculiar to England, growing up in the midst of Chat Moss—a swampish, moory, fenny, impracticable, productive, most fertile, howling wilderness—I say, assuredly, if one sees this, one cannot doubt, that the immense tracts of *terra firma* that one sees uncultivated in every part of the country, must, with comparatively little expense, be made capable of all possible improvement. Give us, then, our commissioners for colonizing waste lands.

3rd. Let us insist upon the repeal of the existing poor-law. It is infidel in its origin, and diabolic in its nature. It arises from a total ignorance of, and indifference to the Word of God. It arises from the notion, that man is the owner of his property, and not its steward; and that the silver and the gold are not of God's donation, but of man's mere procuring. Let us, then, without hesitation recognise the right of God's poor, and trust to God's grace and truth to supply us with the means amply to concede it. It is almost a lie that there is such a thing as a lazy man. Under the influence of Christian legislation, it would not be almost, but altogether false. In effect, when radical reform takes place—when truth has free course through the realm, every man will sit in peace under his own vine, and under his own fig-tree, and there will be so little of complaining in the land, that it will be rather a luxury than a grievance to remove it.

4th. Let us have a board of commissioners, called "Her Majesty's Board of Commissioners for the promotion of Christian knowledge,

and the discouragement of wickedness and vice." Why should the publication of tracts by authority have ceased with the Elizabethan era? With what vast effect would publications "by authority," exposing the evils of Popery, tell upon the Irish mind? Let the principle of prosecution for opinion be abandoned; but let our commissioners, wherever the devil gets an agent to open an infidel or licentious book-shop, open themselves a government dépôt for the diffusion of counteracting sentiment. Let the light be made to shine so clearly that it shall cast shame upon the doers and the deeds of darkness. Every evil doer has a coward heart; he knows that he is wrong, and there is only demanded the firmness of mild wisdom, not so much to put him down, as to enlist him as an ally on the side of virtue. It is the unchristian character of the government—perhaps we may truly say its antichristian character—which originates most of the deplorable cases of frowardness and iniquity which shock the sense of the well-disposed. Allowing as they, the government, do, the tide to flow full in the direction of depravity, it is little to be wondered at that the ill-disposed should be hardened in their evil courses. The state of things would be quite different did those in high places show themselves, which, in point of fact they ought to do, as the allies of truth, virtue, and religion.

Of this board of commissioners all the bishops should be *ex-officio* members.

Only conceive—

"REVEREND AND DEAR SIR,—It is my wish that you should preach on Sunday se'nnight, in the open air, in Trafalgar-square. If it be consistent with your arrangements so to do, give notice to the "Board of Commissioners for the propagation of Christian knowledge," to whom I have notified my wish, and they will take care that the necessary announcement and preparation shall be made.

"I remain, Reverend and dear Sir,

"Your faithful Servant,

"To the Rev. ——"

"C. J. LONDON."

The reply of the gifted man addressed—and recollect, the employment of any but a gifted man, a man of mind, a man of power, such men as God fits—peculiarly fits for great purposes, and whom, if the church were not to a great extent wrapt in a deep slumber, she would, even as things are at present constituted, seek out and honour—would be utterly vain in such a service. If the spirit of nepotism, or partiality, or a disposition to flatter rank, led to the attempt in the case which I suppose, to inflict some humdrum personage upon the public, the public scorn which would meet the attempt would be a proper punishment. But the gifted of the church—those whom the fiat of public opinion has stamped with the mark of public approbation—being discovered and employed, to suppose that the effect would not be immense would be perfectly absurd; Dr. Croly, Hugh M'Neill, Hugh Stowell, Baptist Noel,—an excellent man, and of great power, warped, however, in some respects, by the bent of the times—Henry Melville—if he have kept clear

of the nonsense of Tractarianism—Tractarianism is just emasculated Popery, the stare and the glare of Popery without its power, the miry clay without the strengthening admixture of the iron : we must have no Popery in any shape—Robert Montgomery, Thomas Mortimer, and some others, would be admirable persons for the work : but it must not be forgotten that the views which I have laid down in this work being carried out, the spirit of division would depart from amongst us, and it would be soon found that the Richard Winter Hamiltons, the Joseph Parsons, the Robert Newtons, the Jabez Buntings, would be in fact identified with the church, and the powers with which they are gifted be available in the most efficient possible manner for the glory of God and the service of society : however, an answer in the affirmative having been received from the clergyman addressed, a servant in purple livery is forthwith seen conveying a letter to the Lord Mayor of London conceived in something of the following terms :—

" MY LORD MAYOR,—I beg leave to inform your lordship that the Rev. ——— will preach in Trafalgar-square on Sunday se'nnight, and I should feel obliged by the attendance of your lordship with your *cortege*.—I remain, my Lord Mayor,

" Your faithful servant,

" To the Right Hon. the Lord Mayor."

" C. J. LONDON."

Similar letters would no doubt be sent to the Sheriffs and other suitable persons. Everything that could be conceived capable of giving weight to the powerful appeal that would be made would be provided. For the benefit of those who could not hear, that appeal in a printed form, would be circulated on the occasion. No doubt it would be reprinted in every daily paper on Monday, and tell with powerful effect upon high and low, upon rich and poor. Truth and virtue would be wafted with lightning speed to the most remote borders of the kingdom, and operate their healing influences upon every heart. Where would Tractarianism then be? Licentiousness would flee like the shades of night before the beams of the rising sun. An enlarged charity would bless the community. Every enemy of England would tremble, and Popery would sink like a millstone in the sea. O blessed times! O happy reform! Where is the man that will not lend his best influence to bring it about! I trust, however, that my readers will remember that I am only giving hints. I attempt not the thing in detail. The attempt would be absurd. I borrow my hints, however, from the Word of God, and from unquestionable precedents in English history.

5th. Of course we should have a board of commissioners for the regulation of factory labour. The abuses that are notorious in this department are so well known, that I think it quite unnecessary to dwell upon them. It is not improper, however, briefly to refer to the subject. My own opinion is, that these abuses simply spring from the prevalence of an irreligious spirit, and that they would be voluntarily

abandoned, were this spirit encountered in the way which I am supposing. I think I before referred to Luther's happy dogma, that no society was ever well-regulated by law. What he evidently meant was this; that the true corrective of abounding social evils was not legal penalty, but Gospel influence. Let the government only essay the production of this influence, and the benevolence which will be the result, will almost altogether do away with abounding misery.

6th. Let us have a board of commissioners called " Her Majesty's Commissioners for the religious instruction of the Irish in their native language." The idea which I here suggest may be, perhaps, involved in something which has gone before. Whether or not, the thought refers merely to a particular case of a more general idea; for, assuredly, the consideration of the Welsh-speaking subjects of the crown, and a provision for their peculiar necessities, as likewise for the necessities of those in the Highlands of Scotland, whose vernacular is the Gaelic, would seem to be the proper business of a paternal government.

I think I may here drop the articulation of my propositions. I should be sorry that my readers should suppose that I had anything like exhausted the subject. I have not even as much as referred to the immensely important subject of scriptural education, of church extension, of the propagation of the faith in foreign lands, &c., &c.; my only object has been to infuse a great idea, which is, briefly expressed, *the development of the Anglican principle of a united Church and State.* Let each person for himself work out this principle, and it will carry him to an extent which, if expressed in words, would require whole volumes to contain them. That development is the radical reform which we require, and which, if pursued as it ought to be, will rescue the denomination of " Radical Reformer " from merely representing a discontented grumbler, who hopes through anarchy to promote his own selfish purposes, and convert it into the title of a saviour of his country.

We are standing upon the very edge of a precipice. When thinking men contemplate the miseries of society, the boundings of vice, wickedness, and infidelity, they are compelled to feel that there is something radically wrong. Many begin to reflect that Protestantism, consisting as it unquestionably does in a law of liberty, is the cause to which abounding evils may be referred. They see that Popery is a system stringent and coercive; that it brings the people under the influence of priestcraft, which, if it would tie their hands from employment in something which might perhaps be beneficial, would also deprive them of a liberty which they see too frequently abused. Hence they conjecture that the adoption of the Romish system is the alternative demanded by the times, apparently forgetful of the truth, that the English system never has received the advantage of a fair experiment. I venture to submit that we may here find an explanation of much of the melancholy apostasy, for which, in especial, Oxford has become opprobrious. I do trust that the consideration of

the other alternative which I have suggested may prove the true corrective of the Tractarian bias, and lead men to the study of the Word of God, and of the principles of the United Church of England and Ireland, with something of a more practical intention than that which has too often accompanied it. I have brought before my readers views that are practicable, the effectuation of which is an object worth living for—aye, and worth dying for too. Those who would be disposed to pronounce them utopian, I would refer to my initiatory paragraphs on the subject of what is practicable impolitics and what not.

Hurrah! then once again for radical reform!

I call upon my readers to join me. For the accomplishment of these very objects the Dublin Protestant Association was organised in the year 1841. At the head of that association there are many members of Parliament and dignitaries of the church. I have developed before thousands and tens of thousands in Dublin, every one of the thoughts which I have here briefly touched upon, and I know them to be capable of eliciting and maintaining an enthusiasm which—if popularly extended, as it is capable of being, must be invincible in its effects. For the obtainment of the reform which I have here laid down, Dublin is organised, Belfast is organised, Cork is organised; and these are the three great cities of our country. I am as certain as I am of life itself, that it only requires the extensive co-operation of the Irish clergy to make every Irish Protestant set himself as a flint, in order to bring about the state of things which I have represented.*

Memorable is the declaration of traitor Peel, that “Ireland was his difficulty.” Aye, and Ireland will be the difficulty of every British government, until the Protestants of Ireland stand out in the might of the Lord, and in the spirit of truth and of their fathers, to neutralise—nay, rather to overpower by a counterbalancing force, the Popish agitation of O’Connell and the priests. Let England behold the descendants of the men of Derry, Aughrim, and the Boyne, standing out in firm array for truth and for the Bible—their trust in God and their powder dry—determined that no power under heaven shall surrender their country to Popery, or shall promote its prevalence and its progress therein; and millions of allies invested with power, wealth, and intelligence, will display themselves on their side. Peel’s or Russell’s statesmanship will be an utter impossibility, and men will be raised up with power in high places to profess the truth and to maintain it too.

Decision against Popery, as a monster evil, is the great quality demanded by the times. If the Apostate Newman never spoke another truth, when he said that the Pope must either be supreme in the church or Antichrist, he uttered an oracle. To regard the Popish system merely as corrupt, and as on a level with other corruptions, is to concede the whole question.

If our fathers were warranted to rend the seamless robe of Christ,

* See Appendix.

to break, as a potter's vessel, the peace of Christendom, merely because the Church of Rome was corrupt, or because, in their conscience, they thought it so, all dissent is at once warranted, schism no sin, separation from the church no fault, ecclesiastical unity an impossibility. For myself, I most distinctly say, that if I did not believe Popery to be the great Apostasy, I should feel myself bound by every possible means to endeavour to restore our church, notwithstanding the corruptions that abound in the Church of Rome, to unity with that church; I should feel myself bound to say that our separation from it was schismatical in its character.

But holding, as we do, that Popery is the Apostasy, we perceive that our separation from it is a thing *sui generis*; it is commanded by God himself. Christ, who has forbidden division, who has commanded his people to be "one, even as he and the Father are one," has in the case of the Church of Rome repealed his own precept. He singles out that church from every other religious community in the world. He points to her, and says, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues!" We separate from her, not because she is corrupt, but because she is the Apostasy. Were she merely corrupt, our business would be to hold on to her communion, and to seek for the reform of those evils which had become inherent in her system. As it is, flight from her is as essential as was flight from the doomed cities of the plain.

CHAPTER X.

CONCLUSION.

It is time that I should close.

I think I have given quite sufficient reasons to show that Popery is the parent curse of Ireland, that nothing can heal the multiplied evils of our country but the prevalence of Protestantism within it, and that under a system of Christian legislation—a legislation that would lend the powers and the resources of the State to the promulgation of Christian truth—Protestantism must inevitably in a short time spread universally in Ireland. I have showed that the union of Church and State implies such a legislation, and that the legitimate working of that union would involve it. We are not deficient in the sort of laws that we want, because the principle from which they should spring is denied, but because that principle, although acknowledged, is not carried out. The duty, therefore, of the Christian patriot, in our times and in our country, is to demand Christian laws; to call for the consistent fulfilment of the functions of our constitution in Church and State; to bear testimony against every deviation from the recognised theory; to point out every anomaly that has crept in at variance with the principle, and to pray for its removal. This is plain Christian duty.

Now, the fulfilment of this duty by Christian people would infallibly produce, as its result, an *alteration in the spirit of the times*.

Let but the Protestants of Ireland, of the metropolis, of the north, of the south, of the east, and of the west, let them but stand forth in the utterance of an honest testimony, and they will carry the empire with them.

Nay, let but right-thinking Protestants do this, let but the Protestant masses do this, let but the operatives and the Orangemen do this, let them powerfully, perseveringly, consistently, immovably, but above all prayerfully do this, and they will not have been doing it three years, until Great Britain and the Empire will be with them.

At first their natural leaders will perhaps stand apart, judging the expectations entertained, and the demands made, extravagant or impracticable, but in a very short time the nobility and gentry will begin to feel that they are contemptible without the people. It is astonishing what an amount of logic and ratiocination mingles itself up with such a state of mind. They will speedily begin to inquire, are not the people right? and rest assured of it, *this position of circumstances will raise up a leader*.

Under the orderings of Divine Providence, it is the times which make the man.

When the multitude are faithful to God, and show it, God does not long leave them without an instrument to reward their faithfulness.

I say that the times will raise up a leader. A leader will combine the gentry with the people, and when the Irish Protestant people stand out in their might, the reason and the truth that are with them, taken in connexion with the necessity that would exist for union with them, in order that the interests of the United Kingdom might be secured, would soon give one heart and one mind to the whole Protestant community of Great Britain and Ireland, and that heart and that mind would be scriptural and Protestant. Before such a state of Protestant feeling everything must bend.

I am not speaking moonshine theories. I speak that I do know.

To this identical work I set myself in Dublin, practically, eight years ago.

My public conduct ever since has been a persevering and consistent effort to bring about the state of things that I contemplate, and in the metropolis at least I have to a great extent succeeded.

Mark the language that I used when I commenced the discussion with Maguire.

"I think it unnecessary to dwell upon what I think likely to be the results of this discussion. I have formed my own conclusion of what these results are likely to be; and I shall only say, that feeling myself in the line of duty in standing before you as I do, I feel a great degree of freedom from anxiety with respect to the results." (*Authenticated Report, Church Edition, 1st day, page 3.*)

The language with which I concluded was to the same effect, but more explicit.

"Mr. Maguire runs away from the question. Yes, you give it up, sir, and I dare you, I defy you to continue it. O! sir, our Roman Catholic countrymen have reason to tremble for themselves, when they see you departing from your colours, and deserting the advocacy of their cause.

"I now give notice, that as soon as it pleases the Lord to recruit my strength, the first thing I shall do will be to give a public lecture in this Rotundo, for the delivery of which I have already received a public requisition, signed by hundreds of names, pointing out to the government of the country the mode of converting Ireland to the truth as it is in Jesus. [I gave the lecture shortly after.] And, sir, I tell you, that you have given a power to one who has been hitherto a *nobody*; and who could not command an audience of a hundred, to go into any city in the land and collect thousands and tens of thousands, who, with their united strength, will join together for the overthrow of the great Apostasy. You are the instrument in the hands of God, of furnishing me with that power, which I pray that God may give me grace to enable me to use in such a way, as that Ireland may return to the pastoral care of her old Catholic and Apostolic Bishops." (*Ibid. Last day, page 509.*)

The result which I calculated on was, first of all, a silencing of that tone of controversial superiority which most unjustly I admit—*most* unjustly—excessively unjustly, but nevertheless in a manner most practically injurious, the Roman Catholic sect in Ireland had previously indulged in. They spoke as if they were in possession of the field of argument, as if their views were incontrovertible, as though the principles of Protestantism were demonstrably and undeniably wrong, as though they absolutely could not be maintained on the platform of discussion. I repeat again and again that they had no ground for this, yet they did it, and it told with power. It produced a deep depression in the Protestant mind, a sense of invincibility in that of the Roman Catholics. It was connected with the most injurious practical consequences. I calculated on the silencing of that tone as preliminary to a great change in public opinion.

To illustrate what I say:—In the year 1837 the publisher of the "Complete [Roman] Catholic Directory, Almanac, and Registry," a work of large circulation, began to give at the end of his Almanac a catalogue of such events of the preceding year as were calculated to be gratifying to his readers. I shall give some extracts from this catalogue, in order that that boastful controversial tone of which I have spoken, may be realized.

Dec. 22, 1835. Right Rev. Dr. Kinsella (Bishop of Ossory) published a letter, demanding of the Protestant Bishop of Gloucester to disclaim a false and scandalous charge on the Catholic Clergy.

Dec. 29, Most Rev. Dr. Murray, C.A.B., of Dublin, in a letter to the same Protestant Bishop, demanded a retraction of the charge attributed to his Lordship.

Jan. 1, 1836. Right Rev. Dr. Kinsella published another letter to the Protestant Bishop of Gloucester, who, in a letter of 2nd January, denied having uttered the charges imputed to him by the reporters against the Irish Catholic Clergy.

Jan. 9. Most Rev. Dr. Murray thanked the said Protestant Bishop for his candour in renouncing the unfounded charges attributed to him.

Jan. 20. Right Rev. Dr. Kinsella published another letter to the Protestant Bishop of Gloucester.

Jan. 27. Rev. Mr. Rickard, P.P. Athboy, published a letter, containing disclaimers of the assertion of the apostate Nolan, that he had "converted Catholics."

Feb. 28. Rev. Mr. M'Hugh republished the letter of the Rev. Mr. Phelan, Fellow of Trinity College, with ample notes, pointing out the lies and misrepresentations of the Rev. Robert J. M'Ghee.

March 9. Rev. Thomas Maguire commenced a series of Lectures in Dublin, on the lies and misstatements propagated in reference to Dens' Theology.

March 26. Rev. Thomas Maguire stated the preliminaries of a public discussion, in which he proposed to meet Rev. R. J. M'Ghee.

March 31. Rev. Thomas Maguire accepted the challenge of do.

April 4. Rev. Thomas Maguire, with a friend, attended at the place proposed, to settle preliminaries with Rev. R. J. M'Ghee, who *did not appear!*

April 11. Mr. R. Coyne, on the part of Rev. Thomas Maguire, after calling Rev. R. J. M'Ghee, a defamer of Dr. Murray, publicly proposed that Rev. R. J. M'Ghee should name another day to settle preliminaries, as the Rev. T. Maguire was ready to meet him in public discussion on any article of Catholic faith, he, Rev. R. J. M'Ghee, being bound to defend those articles of the Protestant creed adverse to Catholic doctrine; which the said Rev. R. J. M'Ghee declined.

June 29. Rev. Mr. Maher, of Carlow, addressed a series of letters to Mr. Bruen, upon gross and malignant charges against the Catholic Clergy.

July 5. O'Neill Daunt, Esq., convicted R. J. M'Ghee of several falsehoods.

Aug. 4. Rev. Thomas Maguire preached in Limerick, and accepted the challenge of the Rev. Mr. Westrop, Protestant Minister, which the latter afterwards declined.

Sept. 1. Rev. Thomas Maguire preached in Liverpool.

— Very Rev. J. Hughes, P.P., presented a memorial to the Lord Lieutenant, requesting an inquiry into the plunder committed by some Protestant Missionaries at Achill.

Nov. 2. Rev. Thomas Maguire challenged the Rev. Hugh M'Neile (who reviled Catholicity in Liverpool) to a *visd voce* public discussion, which the latter declined.

Similar vauntings appear in the next year's almanac; they involve daring and scurrilous attacks upon all those opposed to them, and show the pitch of insolence to which long-continued impunity had raised the priests.

Dec. 31, 1836. The apostate O'Beirne fully exposed by Rev. J. W. Fairclough.

Jan. 10, 1837. The *visd voce* controversial discussion between the Very Rev. J. Hughes, P.P., and Rev. Mr. Stoney, Protestant Minister, took place at Castlebar, to the discomfiture of the latter. The horrid impiety displayed by the Protestant Minister, shocked every rational Protestant present.

Jan. 25. Rev. N. French, of Ballimore, wrote a letter to the P. Bishop of Down and Connor, on his misstatement on education.

In recording those sacrilegious acts, it is curious that they were generally perpetrated near where the violent apostates, Nolan, Delany, and O'Sullivan, excited the outcasts of society against the Catholic religion! "By their fruits you shall know them!"

March 2. Rev. H. O'Kane, C.C., Ballygawly, challenged the Protestant Minister to name nine, much less "*an immense number,*" who attended the preaching of the apostate Nolan.

May 29. Rev. Thomas Maguire preached in the Catholic church, Belfast.

June 30. Most Rev. Dr. Murray, in a letter, exposed "the disgraceful fraud of

the Rev. Robert M'Ghee," in saying that he had called Bellarmine a class-book in Maynooth College.

July 11. A splendid public dinner was given to the Rev. Thomas Maguire, by the Catholics of Glasgow, at which he delivered a powerful speech, and accepted the boasted challenge of the fabricator, Rev. J. M'Ghee.

—— The Irish Catholics of Glasgow, presented a splendid piece of plate, with a suitable address, to the Rev. Thomas Maguire, "as a sacred token of their love, respect, and admiration, and to commemorate his signal services to their holy religion and country."

—— Rev. Mr. Campbell, of Belfast, published a letter, in which he advanced facts and witnesses to prove that the abandoned apostate Delany confessed that his recent attacks on Catholicity were inspired by mercenary motives, and that he retracted his errors.

July 10. Rev. B. Davys, C.C., Longford, published a letter in refutation of charges against himself and other Catholic clergymen.

Sept. 3. Rev. Thomas Maguire wrote a letter, repeating the substance of his speech at Glasgow, and once more accepting the challenge of the Rev. Robert M'Ghee, which the latter declined after his scandalous braggadocio!

Oct. 6. A Catholic's refutation of Rev. Robert M'Ghee's lies and slanders concerning Catholic oaths.

Nov. 26. Letter, by Rev. M. Conolly, (now) P.P., Crossboyne, proving the lies and fallacies of the Rev. Achill Missionaries.

Nov. 9. Curious letter of D. O'Connell, Esq., M.P., to the Bishops and Clergy of the Protestant Church in Ireland, on the "Tithe settlement."

The same tone continued up to the very discussion, with respect to the issue of which Roman Catholics were lifted up to an extraordinary height of expectation. The following extracts will illustrate this:—

Oct. 25, 1837. Rev. Dr. J. Brown, of Downside College, published a refutation of the untruths of the apostate E. F. O'Beirne, touching Maynooth College.

—— Rev. P. O'Farrell, of Bristol, exposed the "Professor of Ingenious Deceits."

Nov. 7. Rev. Richard Boyle, of Hereford, published some letters against this reverend calumniator.

Nov. 30. Rev. P. O'Farrell's exposure of Rev. R. M'Ghee's petition against Maynooth College.

Dec. 15. Rev. J. W. Foster, V.G., and other Protestant Ministers in Limerick, propose to preach against Rev. T. Maguire, who had been then and there preaching.

Dec. 16. Rev. T. Maguire, in a letter to those gentlemen, proposed that himself and two other Catholic Clergymen would meet any three Ministers of the Establishment to discuss any or every article of their respective creeds, which the Protestant *challengers* decline.

Dec. 17. Letter of Rev. T. Maguire on the retreat of the Protestant Parsons of Limerick.

Dec. 18. Rev. T. Maguire was entertained at a public dinner in Limerick.

Dec. 21. Rev. P. Heffernan, Heythrop Park, silences Rev. W. Way, Protestant Minister.

Dec. 27. Letters from Rev. C. P. A. Cumberback, Catholic Pastor of Stoor, to the Protestant Bishop of Oxford, on the calumnies of Rev. Mr. Fox.

—— Series of letter by "Verax," in answer to Rev. W. H. Hook, M.A., in defence of Catholicism.

—— Mr. John Larkin exposes the lies of the apostate O'Beirne, and announces the conversion of five Protestants, of whom two were Ministers of the Establishment.

Dec. 27. The Editor of *The Devonshire Advertiser* publicly apologises to Rev. Dr. Brown for inserting an atrocious attack upon him by the apostate O'Beirne.

Jan. 15, 1838. A layman's reply to the calumnies of the Rev. Mr. Minchin, of Dublin.

Jan. 19. Admirable letter of Rev. T. Maguire, in answer to the calumnies of the "Professor of Ingenious Devices, Rev. M. M'Ghee," proposing to meet him on terms of alternate defence and attack, or for ever to remain silent. This letter contained a tremendous castigation of the itinerant declaimer, who shrunk from the combat.

March 20. Public meeting at Bath, at which Rev. Dr. Brown and other gentlemen proved that the Rev. R. J. M'Ghee prepensively and wickedly misquoted several books and documents, to promote the "hatred of Popery." (See report of this important meeting.)

March 30. Rev. T. D. Gregg publicly challenged Rev. T. Maguire to a public controversial discussion.

April 2. "Verax" commences a series of letters to the Protestant Bishop of Exeter on Catholicity.

April 4. Rev. T. Maguire, accompanied by Mr. R. Coyne, wait on the Rev. T. D. Gregg to accept his challenge.

April 5. Preliminary meeting of Rev. T. Maguire, Rev. T. D. Gregg, and mutual friends, at which, after some questions, the former accepts the challenge of the latter.

April 7. Letter of Rev. T. Maguire, requesting a final answer from Rev. T. D. Gregg.

April 9. Meeting of Rev. Messrs. Maguire and Gregg, and friends, when the preliminary arrangements of the Discussion were agreed to, and regularly signed.

April 10. Meeting of the friends of the reverend disputants, when Mr. Gregg's friends declined acting.

April 11. Another request of Rev. T. Maguire to have a distinct answer.

April 12. The "Professor of Ingenious Devices," in a letter, advises Rev. T. D. Gregg not to meet the Rev. Mr. Maguire.

April 16 and 17. One of Rev. T. D. Gregg's friends, waits on Mr. Coyne as the Rev. Mr. Maguire's friend, to settle on taking the place of meeting, but declines acting.

April 18. Rev. T. D. Gregg, finding all his friends decline acting, becomes himself personally responsible with Mr. Coyne for the place of meeting.

— Curious letter of the apostate Meyler, backing out of all responsibility for his "friend" Mr. Gregg.

— Mr. R. Coyne's letter to Rev. T. D. Gregg, showing how all his "friends" had declined acting for him, and requesting himself to become, with him, responsible for the expense of the place of meeting.

April 19. Agreement of Rev. Mr. Gregg and Mr. Coyne to take the Rotundo for the intended Discussion.

April 20. Resolution of the Committee of the Rotundo to give their rooms for the Discussion.

April 23. Extraordinary documents by Rev. William Burgh, Protestant Chaplain to Dub. F. Penitentiary, and the Rev. Archdeacon Torrens, against the Rev. T. D. Gregg.

May 14. Admirable letter of Rev. T. Maguire, in reply to a letter attributed to Rev. Mr. Pope.

May 25. Letters of Rev. T. Maguire to Rev. T. D. Gregg, announcing his chairman at the intended Discussion.

From 29th May to 9th June, Sunday exclusive. Controversial *visd voce* Discussion in the Rotundo, Dublin, between Rev. Thomas Maguire, P.P., Ballinamore, and Rev. T. D. Gregg, in which the former exceeded even the high opinion of his warmest friends, and the latter cut a more contemptible figure than any other advocate of Protestantism ever did before.

This last vaunt is practically refuted. Since that time Maguire has been silenced, and all the priests with him. They do not dream of discussion; and if the system that I succeeded in be pursued and persevered in, they never will.

The Lent which succeeded my discussion saw Dublin undisturbed by Father Tom. For the first time during a long series of years, his voice, during the Lent, was not heard in the metropolis. Subsequently, he took advantage of the treatment I received from Dr. Whately, to make an appearance; but I well knew how to drive him from the city, and accordingly for the last two or three years he has made no appearance here, and it is the fault of the Protestant clergy if he appear anywhere else. I undertake, with the Divine blessing, if called upon by any Protestant clergyman, to keep him free from any intrusion on the part of this the greatest of Roman Catholic controversialists.

I trust that I may be excused for the giving of the above extracts; it is to a very considerable extent painful to me to do so, because, however false the reflections on my friends are which they involve, it cannot in the nature of things be pleasant to them that these reflections should be put on record; at the same time, I believe that my friends are too sensible and too wise to feel any serious concern in the matter. I think myself in an especial manner bound here to express the disgust with which I review the observations on my truly talented, learned, and pious brother in Christ, the Rev. R. J. M'Ghee. I distinctly admit that, in point of eloquence—in point of accurate acquaintance with Popish documents, in point of learning, sacred and profane, I hold myself to be greatly inferior to my highly-esteemed friend. Had he never done more than write, "Episcopal and Clerical Duty and Responsibility Considered," that work would be quite sufficient to stamp him as a superior mind, to lay the church under an eternal obligation to him, and to prove that his promotion to station and influence within the church, would be a matter of great importance to her best interests. It is, therefore, with the utmost sincerity I say that I regard the attacks upon him which I here put forward with disgust; but, "like the toad, ugly and venomous, they have a precious jewel in their head." They are calculated to illustrate the defective views which my friend takes of the Roman Catholic controversy. In this respect, truth, and the interests of the church, compel me to say that he is distinctly wrong. These are no times for miserable flattery. If a Cicero in eloquence—a saint in holiness—and an Ussher in erudition, encountered an adequately informed priest, to fight the battle of the church on the foundation that my friend M'Ghee assumes, I will not say he would be beaten, but this I will say, that the priest would not be silenced; and I add, furthermore, that if the views, in the assertion of which God has made me triumphant, be abandoned by the church, there is nothing before us, but to look for a career of Popery from strength to strength.

On the other hand, let these views be insisted on—they are absolutely irrefutable; let the Protestants of Ireland stand out in the simple assertion of Church Principles—pronouncing Popery "the

"Apostasy," and the Pope "that Man of Sin;" and doing this incessantly in the ears of our Legislature and our government, by degrees a sound public opinion will be created, correct views will universally abound, the constitution be set to rights, the Church reformed, and Popery for ever overthrown in Ireland; and when it falls here, it will perish in all the world beside. I cannot resist the temptation of giving in this place the celebrated letter of the Bishop of Mentz to Con O'Nial, exhorting him to take arms for Popery in Ireland in the time of Henry the Eighth. The document is a vulgar one, and has been often quoted, but it is really deserving of recollection.

My son O'Nial. Thou and thy fathers were ever faithful to the mother Church of Rome. His holiness, Paul, the present Pope, and his council of holy fathers, have lately found an ancient prophecy of one Saint Lazerianus, an Irish Archbishop of Cashel. It saith that the Church of Rome shall surely fall when the Catholic faith is once overthrown in Ireland. Therefore, for the glory of the mother Church, the honour of Saint Peter, and your own security, suppress heresy, and oppose the enemies of his holiness. You see that when the Roman faith perisheth in Ireland the See of Rome is fated to utter destruction. The council of cardinals have, therefore, thought it necessary to animate the people of the Holy Island in this pious cause: being assured that while the mother Church hath sons of such worth as you, and those who shall unite with you, she shall not fall, but prevail for ever, in some, degree at least, in Britain. Having thus obeyed the order of the sacred council, we recommend your princely person to the protection of the Holy Trinity, of the Blessed Virgin, of Saint Peter, Saint Paul, and all the host of heaven. Amen.

It was an oracle that spoke—another Caiaphas! The prophecy of this old "Saint" is the very reason of the thing—it is the common sense of the matter. The Irish temperament is so deplorably suited to Popery, so prepossessed to fall in with its delusions, that when Popery falls in this country, it is unlikely to continue its hold upon any portion of the human family. Let us, therefore, devote ourselves with all our hearts, and with all our souls, to the utterance of a faithful testimony against it; and if all its victims be not saved, we shall not at least rest under any responsibility for that doom with which, if they reject our admonitions, they will speedily be overtaken. Let us work while it is day, for the night cometh when no man can work. (John ix. 4.)

If any one should say that I have urged in those pages a system of legislation which might just as easily be turned against Protestantism as Popery, and which none would be more likely to exclaim against, if so employed, than myself, I should meet the statement by a direct negative. Laws of the nature which I have described would be utterly vain against the reformed faith. Why? Because that faith is undeniably true. The most energetic legislation against a system founded on truth would be utterly vain. Such a system possesses a weapon which would frustrate all legislative measures to strike it down. That weapon is REPLY—answers, argument, reason. It is because Popery is destitute of these that it is fragile and destructible. It exists on

our forbearance ; it triumphs through our indifference ; though built upon the sand it stands, simply because we do not direct against it the overwhelming streams of invincible truth.

Should the government reject our admonitions and our warnings, and adopt the revolutionary step of dissociating Church and State, I would look upon the change with anything but alarm. I am convinced it would work for good. Were the Church of Ireland left to itself, soon would her clergy, unbiassed by the influence of a hostile, or at least an indifferent power, devote their energies with a single eye to the advancement of the glory of their Master and the salvation of souls ; and, as in former times, Popery would sink before them. A more deplorable state of things than the continuance of the present, it is not possible to conceive.

I, at least, for one, feel a perfect confidence in the ultimate realization of that which I have contemplated—the eradication of Popery from Ireland. For that great result I trust I may be allowed to struggle. I look for it under God from a revolution in the spirit of the times. *That* is to be effected through the influence of those who are already right-minded ; and it is my earnest prayer, that God of his infinite mercy may be pleased to make this very defective work in some degree effectual for the promotion of unity, concord, and co-operation among them.

APPENDIX.

Page 10.

The following is the letter alluded to:—

“LETTER TO HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

“Dublin, Swift's Alley, May 12, 1837.

“MAY IT PLEASE YOUR GRACE,—Having had an interview with Doctor Dickinson, I am aware that you are acquainted with the circumstances of the Free Church in Swift's Alley. I need not therefore occupy you with any lengthened detail with respect to them. In effect, they may be briefly stated thus :—The trustees have purchased the place, in the hope thereby to subserve the interests of religion and of the Church of England. In furtherance of their object they have appointed me as chaplain ; and I have accepted the office in the earnest hope that my labours in the Lord may prove a blessing to souls and a benefit to Ireland. Having had the privilege of acting as a licensed clergyman in the diocese of York for nearly nine years last past—first, as incumbent of a small living, Earls Heaton, in the parish of Dewsbury; and afterwards as curate of St. George's Church, Sheffield—I am well acquainted with the very happy state of things in the English church; and as I know of many proprietary chapels, (as they are called,) in which services the most valuable are rendered to the church and to Christianity, although the chapels themselves are not directly under episcopal jurisdiction, I have not hesitated to accept the post of usefulness in Swift's Alley, the church in which is very nearly under the same circumstances with those chapels above alluded to, although it is not as yet licensed by your grace. I would, however, very earnestly desire to be directly under your grace's sanction, and am therefore anxious that the chapel should be licensed. From the conversation that I had with Doctor Dickinson, I think I understand the grounds on which your grace has heretofore refused a license to the place, and I fully justify the propriety of your grace's refusal. It is evidently unreasonable to expect that you should grant an *absolute* licence to a place of worship, if you have not a proper control over the appointment of the minister. It is plain that to grant a licence without such control would be incompatible with the exercise of the functions of your grace's high office. The holy jealousy, therefore, of your grace, for God's truth and the welfare of souls, amply explains the reason of your refusing to grant *such* a license to Swift's Alley. On the other hand, the trustees have *their* jealousy, through which they refuse to resign the absolute appointment of a chaplain to the place. From the increasing influence of Papists in high places operating with such power as that influence especially does in the affairs of Ireland, there is no knowing the dispositions of the prelates who might peradventure be your grace's successors. Apprehensions are entertained that they, or some of them, might not have that utter hatred of Popery which characterises the Articles and Homilies of our holy church; and that therefore they might resist the appointment of a chaplain who would act towards the Apostasy with that decision and power, which are rendered so imperative by the circumstances of our unhappy country.

"Your grace, from your superior wisdom and deep acquaintance with the human character, will, I am sure, perceive that this feeling on the part of the trustees is not unnatural, and may perhaps be wholesome; if there be any degree of over scrupulousness about it, I feel perfectly convinced that you will allow for and pardon it; and in the exercise of your goodness not allow it to stand in the way of a compliance with my humble request, the nature of which, I trust, you may collect from this letter.

"I do not ask for the chapel such a licence from your grace as would extend to my successor, or involve your countenance of the chapel in case of the appointment of a chaplain whose character or doctrine you might not approve of. What I humbly request is, that you should license it during my incumbency (if I may use that word); in fact, I desire that both I and the place of worship with which I am connected, should be subject to your control, and be placed under your auspices. I think I succeeded in making my desire plain to Doctor Dickinson; if I do not mistake, he informed me that the law would not allow a compliance with my request. I would very humbly say, that if this be so, the state of the law requires alteration; for surely the law, instead of throwing an obstacle in the way of the laity contributing to the spread of the Gospel among the people, when that exceedingly desirable object may be effected with a perfect security of the faith and the maintenance of sound doctrine, should afford the most ample opportunity and encouragement to them to engage in so glorious a work. However, should your grace be pleased to enter into my views, and consent to grant my request, (the law not forbidding,) I will feel deeply indebted to your grace; and should I discover that the law stands opposed to my wish, and the wish, I may also say, of the trustees, we will in that case, your grace assenting, bring the matter before Parliament, so as that you may be enabled to follow out your grace's desires in our behalf. Your grace will perceive that in all I have ventured to say, I have gone upon the supposition of your grace's approbation of myself. This I have presumed to do, as having been a long-tried labourer in the vineyard of the Lord. I shall not have the boldness, of course, to allude to my services in the church, nor to urge (although I might do it with the utmost truth,) that my single desire is, to promote the spiritual benefit of souls, and to exert myself for the benefit of Ireland. I shall, therefore, only say, that I have heretofore possessed the favour of both the clergy and laity in the sphere of my labours; and that I am, of course, provided with all the needful testimonials. In fact, having enjoyed the approbation of my late diocesan and superiors, I conclude myself to be entirely unobjectionable to your grace.

"Trusting that you may be so kind as to excuse this lengthy communication, and to forgive any defects connected with the expression of my desires, I have the honour to remain, your grace's most humble and obedient servant in Christ,

"T. D. GREGG,

"Chaplain of Swift's-Alley Free Church."

Page 16.

Extract from the *Statesman* :—

"SWIFT'S-ALLEY FREE CHURCH.

On Sunday morning last, a considerable number of the members of the usual congregation, with several respectable strangers, met at the hour for service in the above place of worship. The Rev. Mr. Gregg addressed them from the communion-table to the following effect:—

"It has been suggested to me, my dear brethren, that I should say a few words to you on the present occasion. You have a right to be informed as to the cause which will prevent the performance of divine service here this morning. You are

aware that this church does not enjoy the privilege of episcopal licence. This, however, has arisen from some informality in the trust deed, as I have always understood. But as the archbishop, while he *did not sanction, did not censure, our services*, I considered that we were warranted in availing ourselves of the opportunities here afforded us, of meeting together as a Christian congregation. The church did not interfere to prevent us; God gave us his blessing; and through the Divine blessing we prospered abundantly. I owe a duty to the church catholic, which would prevent, and always has prevented, my acting in opposition to its authorities. A late occurrence has entirely altered our position, and has placed a barrier that prevents me from acting here any longer. I was announced to preach this day against Popery, in Lucan church. The archbishop, as you are aware, has interdicted me on the ground that I am not licensed. Here is an act of opposition that could not be exercised towards an authorised minister. Were I to minister here one hour after such a censure, I should be acting in *opposition*—mind, I beg of you, in *opposition* to ecclesiastical authority, a thing which I dare not do. *If the archbishop opposed me for doing a right thing, I trust God would give me grace to stand firm and immovable—then he would be wrong, and I would be right*; then I would be the maintainer, and he the person infringing the laws, and acting in opposition to the voice of the church. *But, when he opposes me upon a point of order, and visits me with censure because it is not complied with, the case is a very different one.* I feel myself bound by duty to submit, and this accordingly I have done. I have resigned the chaplaincy of this church, and am no longer its minister. I know you will justify me in the act. You perceive that *I was called on by principle to adopt it.* The dictate of sound principle is the voice of God himself, and we must not dare to oppose it. It is painful to me to separate from so many whom I cordially loved, and whose Christian affection I enjoyed; but there is no alternative. God has been with us here—he has manifestly blessed our work; nor are we to conclude otherwise because it has pleased him now to terminate it. In the inscrutable wisdom of his providence he often acts thus. He is a Sovereign, and will do all his pleasure. He dismissed ELLIJAH to the solitudes of Cherith—He removed Moses to the back side of the desert. Should he be pleased so to deal with his unworthy servant now, his will be done. Never can I cease to remember with gratitude the labours here carried on, which he so highly honoured; and the affectionate, and attentive, and devout people who here steadily assembled. Let us hope that this distressing occasion may be properly improved, and henceforth, lead those who take an interest in providing places of worship, to avoid any irregularity in point of form that may cause objections—to do all things in due order; and, on the other hand, lead those in high places to seek for the removal of every impediment which may prevent the truth from having free course, and being glorified.

“Having offered up a prayer, the reverend gentleman dismissed those assembled.”

Page 25

In the First Edition of this work, and when the first sheets were in the printer's hands, the account given in the preceding pages exactly described the relation in which the author stood to Archbishop Whately. Before, however, the work was finished, the Archbishop adopted a new course of policy. He asserted my want of title to officiate without his licence, and proceeded by extremely harsh steps to prevent my doing so. After a tacit allowance on his part, for nearly six years, I thought this very hard, and I resisted it. Notwithstanding the command of Dr. Whately, I pursued my usual course. Had I submitted, I must, as a plaintiff, in order to compel him to allow me my rights, have brought him into the Ecclesiastical Courts. By my resistance I threw the *onus prosequendi* upon him, and accordingly his grace is now *pursuing* me at full cry on this new claim of his to Episcopal

jurisdiction over me, and for contumacy, and so forth, in disputing his authority. My plea is, that he has no authority over me at all; that I am exempt by law from his jurisdiction; that his attempt to stretch that jurisdiction over me is wrong, and if so, an act of tyranny. I have received the weightiest legal opinion that this is so, and I have every expectation that my plea will be established by the tribunals. Did I think the Archbishop of Dublin had jurisdiction over me, I should at once bow to Dr. Whately; but believing myself to be in a "peculiar," I stand upon my privilege, thinking that it is the part of a good churchman as much to refuse submission to an illegal claim, though made by an Archbishop, as to bow to his authority when it is made according to law.

However, in my First Edition, I gave a very long narrative of the whole affair, conceived in a deep feeling of indignation against what I considered, and still consider, treatment most unjust on the Archbishop's part, and entirely undeserved by me. I am unwilling, however, to perpetuate the remembrance of an exasperation which was, I think, fully justified by circumstances, and properly expressed at the moment of their occurrence. I therefore expunge the narrative altogether. Indeed, however important it may be to me as an individual, it is too paltry a matter to deserve record in a work which I humbly trust may be of lasting interest, and which is intended, at least, to operate important effects upon society at large. In prospect of the legal decision which must soon be come to, I shall only say—"God defend the right!"

Be it understood, however, that the quarrel between the Archbishop and myself is simply a question of jurisdiction.

Page 361.

Never was the whole kingdom more ripe for energetic action than previously to the adoption by the Legislature of the flagrant proposition of Sir Robert Peel, (now unfortunately become law,) which increases and perpetuates the grant to the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth. Never was there a greater anxiety on the part of the Protestant masses to see a manifestation of a determined and uncompromising opposition on the part of legislators—an opposition that did not know how to yield. The whole kingdom hailed with delight an announcement that was made at an early stage of the business by Sir Culling Eardly Smith, to the effect that some dozen members of Parliament were prepared rather "to die on the floor of the House," than to allow the flagitious purposes of Ministers to be embodied in a law. Taking the truthfulness of this representation for granted, I felt quite certain that the measure never could be carried. It involved so flagrant a violation of principle, it was so open to unanswerable attack, its discussion presented an opportunity so ample for nationally exhibiting the *virus* of Popish principle, that I felt convinced if such a spirit as Sir Culling Eardly Smith spoke of existed in Parliament, the discussion on the bill of Ministers might be so protracted, their own unprincipled conduct so exposed, and Roman Catholics so distinctly placed in the wrong, that the whole country would be aroused, and a revolution more likely than the obtaining of the seal of the kingdom to the threatened act of foul and abominable national apostasy.

I was deputed to attend the Anti-Maynooth conference in London, both by the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee for Ireland, and by the Dublin Protestant Operative Association, and at the first sitting of that conference at the London Tavern, I thus spoke on the subject of the declaration of Sir Culling Smith. I reprint my speech from a work "Compiled and edited at the request of the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee [of London], by the Rev. S. Thelwall," entitled "Proceedings of the Anti-Maynooth Conference of 1845."

"It has been industriously stated, that either there are apathy and indifference with respect to the measure, or else an extensive approval of it on the part of the Protestants of Ireland. (Hear, hear.) With the best possible information, with the largest opportunity of understanding the Protestant mind of Ireland, I protest

that any such idea is entirely unfounded. (Hear, hear.) The measure is utterly abominable in the eyes of those who call themselves the Protestants of Ireland, and who constitute the great body of that people. Their most earnest aspirations and prayers are, that it may be rejected. (Cheers.) You, Mr. Chairman, gave utterance to a statement a short time since which has been taken hold of, and has been urged by the Protestants of Ireland, in reference to this destructive measure. That statement was, that there was a small minority of faithful men in Parliament, some of whom have resolved that they will die on the floor of the House rather than see this measure become law. (Cheers.) I can tell you that there is a general apprehension, that if such faithfulness be not manifested on the floor of Parliament—that if there be not exhibited that faithfulness which will take hold of every means which Providence has placed in the hands of legislators to impede a course of legislative conduct which is opposed to the minds and religious feelings of the masses of this country—and that if, through the want of such faithfulness, this measure should be allowed to pass, the consequences may be fatal; for it is apprehended that if such a course be not adopted, and the measure should once become law, the feeling which is now so providentially awakened on the subject, may cool before the next election; (loud cries of ‘No, no;’) and that that which has once been done will not hereafter be required to be undone again. (Continued cries of ‘No, no.’) I rejoice to hear expressions of dissent from that opinion; but this much we do know, that the future is a contingency, and that if there be the power and the will now to reject it, the danger will at once be obviated, and we shall be delivered from the impending evil. (Hear, hear.) To those individuals of whom you spoke, the Protestants of Ireland look with most anxious expectation. They do trust, that amendments will be brought forward *seriatim*, and *seriatim* be made matter of deliberation, of division, and of impediment; (cheers;) that the faithful men to whom you referred will despise the imputation of faction, when it may almost be said—I speak it with great tenderness, and with no feeling which is not consistent with the most perfect loyalty—when I say, it may almost be said that the conduct of the government itself would seem to be the conduct of a faction. (Cheers.) Further I beg to state, that it is the feeling of the people of Dublin, that if this measure be passed, it will aggravate more than ever the Repeal cry of the day; for if the Legislature, by such an act as this, should withdraw its protest against Popery—teaching those doctrines which itself has deprecated, and thus indicate that those doctrines are right—will it not stamp with gross injustice every single act of British conduct towards Ireland in past times, and put a powerful argument into the mouth of O’Connell, to show that nothing but disunion from Great Britain can save Ireland from British tyranny? (Hear, hear.) That sentiment prevails extensively in Dublin; and we all look with anxiety to this conference. I am a member of the Anti-Maynooth Committee in that city, and I am connected with some of the largest organisations of Protestants. We look to this Central London Anti-Maynooth Committee for instruction, advice, counsel, and direction. Our present feeling is—and I am desirous of urging it on you in the strongest manner—that you should not fail to adopt measures to retard, procrastinate, impede, and utterly prevent the Maynooth bill from passing into a law. (Hear, hear.) I tell you further, that a feeling prevails in Dublin, that there is not much to be expected from the House of Lords. They apprehend that that House, through the Duke of Wellington, is greatly under the influence of the government; consequently it is felt that it is in committee the fight must take place, and that the great object of this conference should be to impress on those members who are opposed to the measure, the necessity for proposing such a series of amendments as might impede the bill, and thus prevent it from passing through the Commons’ House of Parliament. I have thus briefly stated the feelings of those whom I represent; and I beg to thank the assembly for the kindness they have manifested towards me.” (Cheers.)—pp. 12, 13.

Sir Culling Eardly Smith himself was in the chair, and the meeting was, perhaps, as likely to be influential as any meeting that had ever been assembled. There could not have been less than 1200 Protestant ministers present, including a large

number of clergymen, and the number had but little diminished during the more important meetings of the conference in London. Approving as all did of the principle of impeding the bill, I set myself to the work of preparing a series of amendments to it, calculated to admit of discussion, and to place the ministry and all the supporters of the bill in a most embarrassing position. Had ministers conceded the amendments, it would have completely altered the character of the college, a thing which never would have been allowed by the Roman Catholic priesthood. And had they opposed the amendments, they would have been equally at fault; the opposition to some of them would involve a distinct maintenance on their parts of the despotism of Popery, and a disregard of the constitutional liberties of the subject. And the opposition to others of them would have involved an amount of favour towards a Popish institution, which they refused to concede to a Protestant one. The amendments, moreover, were of such a nature as that they would have been no less embarrassing to the Popish advocates of the bill, than to its ministerial supporters; for, on the one hand, by adopting them, they would upset Maynooth as a Popish seminary, and on the other, by the rejection of them, they would forfeit their own character for liberality, and stultify the outcry that they were making against Trinity College, Dublin, and against both of the English Universities. I submitted the amendments to some of the clerical members of the conference who were greatly struck with them, and at once perceived the important use that might be made of them. I likewise submitted them to an influential member of Parliament, who suggested that they should be brought before the conference, and that if they were taken up by the ministers from the provinces, who might be considered as speaking the mind of respectable constituencies, and brought one or more of them by these ministers, each to his own representative, who should thus insert on the books of the House a notice of the amendment or amendments which he might feel most disposed to press, it would manifest an opposition so systematic and extensive, as could scarcely fail to impede, and, indeed, to defeat the measure. For an opposition of such a character would be likely greatly to stimulate the hostility to the bill that had been already awakened, and to convince the whole kingdom that, in opposing it, they were but maintaining the cause of constitutional liberty.

I did not take a copy of the amendments; and the original MS., in a manner that will appear in the sequel, became lost. If I cannot, however, give the words which I made use of, I am sure I can convey the exact nature of my propositions, so as that the reader may fully understand the bearing which their proposal and discussion would have been likely to have had upon the fate of the bill. This, therefore, I shall endeavour to do; the terms of the amendments (as well as I can recollect them,) are distinguished, when necessary, in what follows, from the words of the bill, by being enclosed in brackets. I number the proposed amendments.

The title of the bill amended as I proposed, was thus:—

1. "An act to amend two acts passed in Ireland, for the better education of persons professing the Roman Catholic religion, and for the better government of the College established at *Maynooth* for the education of such persons, and also an act passed in Parliament of the United Kingdom, for amending the said two acts," [and to open the said college for secular instruction for the benefit of the public in general].

The next amendment which I proposed was on the fourth clause, which, amended, would have been as follows:—

2. "IV. And whereas it is expedient that provision should be made for the payment of the salaries of the president, vice-president, officers, and professors of the said college, and for the expense of commons, attendance, and other necessities, to be supplied to and for their use; and that the number of professors therein should be increased;" [and that the professorships of secular learning should be open to the public in general, without distinction of religious creed; and that the election to said professorship should be conducted in a manner calculated to ensure the appointment of the most meritorious. Be it therefore enacted, that from and after the passing of this act, all the professorships, save those of theology, shall be open to the public in general, without distinction of religious profession; and that

for the five years next ensuing after the passing of this act, when any professorship of secular knowledge, such as belles lettres, mathematics, history, political economy, natural philosophy, and so forth, shall become vacant, an announcement of the said vacancy, and of the election for the filling of the same, shall be affixed to the gates of the said college, and advertised in the *Dublin Gazette* one calendar month before said election; and that the election be made by public examination of the candidates, to be holden in the examination hall of the said college; and that seven days after said examination, the decision to be on the merits of the candidates, and publicly announced, provided that, *ceteris paribus*, said decision be in favour of a former *alumnus*, or former *alumni*, of said college; provided also, that the president and vice-president be always members of the Roman Catholic church; and be it enacted that after the termination of five years from the passing of this act, none shall be eligible to the professorship of said college save those who have been its former *alumni*;] “and be it further enacted, that from and after the passing of this act, there shall be paid and payable to the said body politic and corporate, for the purposes aforesaid, any sum or sums of money not exceeding, in the whole, the sum of [five] thousand pounds.”

The next clause on which I proposed an amendment was the sixth, which provided for the admission of two hundred and fifty additional free students into the college. Amended as I proposed, it would have run thus:—

3. “VI. And whereas there are three senior and four junior classes in the said college, and two hundred and fifty free students on the establishment, maintained and educated out of the annual parliamentary grant made to the said college; and whereas it is expedient that provision should be made for an additional number of free students, that is to say, for two hundred and fifty free students in the said three senior classes, and two hundred and fifty free students in the said junior classes. Be it therefore enacted, that from and after the passing of this act, there shall be paid and payable to the said body politic and corporate, for each of the said two hundred and fifty free students, in the said three senior classes, the annual sums for that purpose specified in the schedule (A) to this act annexed.” [Provided always, that of the two hundred and fifty additional free students who will be thus admitted into the said college, and provided for therein, fifty, at the least, be admitted irrespectively of their religious profession, should so many non-Roman Catholics apply; provided also, that the said fifty not being Roman Catholics, be exempted from all and every attendance on religious instruction, lectures, worship, and so forth, and be allowed to be quite unmolested on the score of their religious sentiments.]

I introduced, in the shape of additional clauses, amendments embodying important principles of liberty, leaving it to any member opposed to the bill to take them up, and place them in the act in whatever position might seem to him expedient. My readers will understand that protraction, impediment, and discussion were the objects. That the bill was opposed by a vast number of persons of the most opposite sentiments, some of whom might undertake amendments, and force discussions on the principle which they involved, which (amendments) others equally opposed to the bill could not be supposed to assent to. For example, although Sir Harry Inglis (the member for Oxford,) could not introduce or support the principle, that a college endowed by the State should be open to all denominations of religionists, a Dissenter might do so. Of the following clauses, amendments, or resolutions, the same may be said. Involving a great variety of principles, they challenged, some of them, the support of the various opponents of the bill, from the wildest radical to the highest churchman, or the most uncompromising Protestant.

It is a matter of notoriety to all those acquainted with Maynooth College, that that seminary imposes on its students the severest restrictions, as far as it respects their liberty. Neither their reading, their correspondence, nor their actions, are free from a degree of control which Protestants would regard as intolerable, which is calculated to engender slavish feelings, and which a Legislature careful for liberty could scarcely countenance. It is furthermore notorious, that their free use of the Scripture is impeded, and that Popery is infamous for the mutilation of the writings

of the Fathers. These circumstances will explain the bearing of the amendments.

Those amendments, then, were something like the following :—

4. And, whereas, it is proper that the aforesaid students, and all others the students of the said college, should be secured in the enjoyment of their just liberty, and guarded against attempts to hamper their freedom in things lawful and praiseworthy, be it therefore enacted, and it is hereby enacted, that the said students may acquire, hold, and possess, if they will so to do, the Holy Scriptures according to the authorised version, and read therein, without being liable to any collegiate censure, punishment, or disadvantage on that account. And be it further enacted, that if any of the professors or heads of the said college do presume to punish, by fine or otherwise, or molest in any other way, students of the said college who may be found reading the Scriptures, that such student or students so forbidden or molested may lay his or their complaint before the visitors, who shall be bound to hear the complaint, and examine into it; and if they find said complaint well founded, they shall be bound to admonish the professor so offending; and should the offence be subsequently repeated, to report his name to the Lord Lieutenant, who shall be warranted, if the offence be aggravated in its character, to dismiss the offender.

5. And whereas it is proper that the correspondence of the students and professors, and other inmates of the college, should be inviolate, be it enacted, that none of the authorities of the said college shall interfere with, or intercept the correspondence of any of the inmates; and that any professor found offending in the premises be admonished by the visitors, and that on a repetition of the offence, the name of the person so offending be handed to the Lord Lieutenant.

6. And be it further enacted, that the students of said college be permitted, at all convenient times and seasons, to communicate with their friends, and to receive their visits, and that there be no impediment thrown in the way, in order to prevent clergymen of the Established Church, or ministers of other denominations, from ingress to said college, and from communication with the students, should the students wish it, at all convenient times and seasons.

7. And whereas it is to be apprehended that mutilated editions of the writings of the Fathers, conveying sentiments as theirs which they never entertained, and excluding sentiments and doctrines which are notoriously theirs, have been prepared and extensively circulated, with the view of deceiving the Roman Catholic mind, and leading it away from the truth; and whereas it is desirable that such deceptions should be prevented, be it therefore enacted, that all the editions of the Fathers employed in the said college in the instruction of the students, be the genuine, un mutilated editions; and that any professor found to employ such like spurious editions be reported to the visitors, and upon the offence being satisfactorily proved, be reproved by them.

Popery thrives by the maintenance of a dark, monkish, secluded spirit; let in upon it the light of civilisation and liberty, and you break down its strongest hold. The following amendments were conceived with that purpose:—

8. And whereas it is expedient that at least one examination of the students annually should be open to the public, be it therefore, and it is hereby enacted, that there shall be such a public examination of the students, immediately previous to the midsummer recess, at which examination there shall be full and free admission to the friends of the students, and to the public in general, only under such limitations for the maintenance of order as may be decided on by the president and vice-president, subject to the approval of the visitors, into the examination halls of the said college.

9. And be it further enacted, that the examinations for professorships shall be conducted publicly, and be open, under similar limitations, to the public in general.

10. And whereas it is expedient that the nature and substance of the lectures of the professors of theology, and of moral philosophy, which may be delivered in said college, as also of the discourses that may be preached in the chapel or chapels thereof should be ascertainable, be it therefore, and it is hereby enacted, that such lectures or discourses be previously written, and authentic copies thereof preserved; or that in case the person or persons who may deliver such lecture or lectures, discourse or discourses, should not previously write the same, that he or they shall give

notice to the president, or in his absence, to the vice-president of the said college, who shall thereupon cause an exact report of such lecture or lectures, discourse or discourses, to be taken down by a qualified reporter, and delivered to him, the president or vice-president of said college; the charge of said reporter to be defrayed out of the grant to the said college.

11. And be it also enacted, that the lectures of the professors of secular science or literature, under such limitations as aforesaid, respecting order, shall be open to the public in general.

The above will give an idea of the character of the amendments which I proposed, which is all that at this distance of time I am able to do. There were several additional, having reference to the establishment of a College library, and its adequate supply with books in the various departments of literature and science, providing against the operation of expurgatorial indices, and for the free access of the students to the books; and other amendments providing for a modification of the course of reading, and for additions to that course made in consideration of that opening of the College to non-Roman Catholics which I proposed. These amendments I do not now sufficiently remember to state: I shall, therefore, only say, that they were conceived in a spirit of fairness and liberality, and framed in accordance with the known practice of Trinity College, Dublin, and therefore, such as would challenge the support of all those who clamoured for liberality in the management of the Universities; they could only be opposed upon the hypothesis that the close system of management should be continued. There were suggested also, numerous alterations in the financial plan—alterations which might be fairly argued to be improvements. In a word, I laid down a plan of systematic opposition that would have involved endless discussion, opened the eyes of the country to the objectionable character of the College, and increased the difficulties of ministers (already considerable) a thousand fold. It had been admitted, that it would have been proper, even by what might have been designated a factious opposition, (such as reiterated motions for adjournment and divisions on the question) to defeat the bill. But being well aware how little the Tory party was disposed for faction, or indeed religious Protestants of *any* sect or party, I felt convinced that an opposition of that kind would never be persevered in, and that unless the opposition were invested with a character of reasonableness, it would not be likely to be long kept up. I constructed my amendments accordingly. They were taken up warmly, especially by one very active and influential clergyman, who accompanied me to several members of Parliament, all of whom seemed of opinion, that if the course proposed were adopted, it might be beneficial. Thus encouraged, on Friday morning, May 2nd, I attended the fourth sitting of the conference, and at the instance of the chairman, Sir Culling Smith, first submitted my resolutions to the Rev. John Blackburne, a distinguished Dissenting minister, who possessed Sir Culling's confidence. Mr. Blackburne having heard the resolutions, advised Sir Culling that it would be well to communicate them to the meeting. Sir Culling then requested a hearing for me, and that I should be allowed to bring forward my proposition. This I accordingly did, and a very lively debate followed; which I give from the work before quoted. "Proceedings," &c., pp. 115—120.

"The CHAIRMAN.—Gentlemen, a communication of some importance will be made to you, on account of which, the hearing of representatives from different places will, for a short time, be suspended.

"The Rev. TRESHAM D. GREGG.—Mr. Chairman, I have had communication with a great number of Members of Parliament, with reference to this bill; and it is my feeling—it is the feeling of the deputation which accompanies me from Ireland—it is the feeling of very many English brethren, that we must immediately do something—something that is practical, in order to impede the progress of the bill. (Hear, hear.) This bill has been announced by Sir Robert Peel as about to pass through committee this very night; which implies, if I mistake not, that there is to be no further discussion on its details. The third reading merely is postponed until

the 19th; which admits of no discussion of the details, but merely the general principle. Consequently, it seems to me, and to the friends whom I met with and have consulted, that this is a most important moment in the progress of our movement. (Hear, hear.) Gentlemen, what we want to do—since the principle of the bill is unhappily affirmed, and it has positively been voted by the House of Commons, that the public money is to be given for the permanent establishment of the College of Maynooth; what we want is, to suggest to the members who represent us in Parliament, distinct amendments—with the object of liberalising and opening the Institution, and thus destroying its inquisitorial and monastic character. The adoption of these amendments would be most important, as it would probably render the bill unacceptable; and a number of friends, in connexion with ourselves, have drawn up a series of amendments, which it will not take me long to read. Some of them are suited for churchmen; some of them are suited for Dissenters; some for Tories; some for Liberals;—all of them are suited for Protestants. Let each man choose an amendment, one or more, for himself; and let him take it to his representative, and say, "Enter that in the books to-night, and let it be discussed and divided upon before the bill passes through committee." Gentlemen, this will give us time. What is done to-night may be fatal; let us, therefore, endeavour to procrastinate as much as possible. We have heads and hearts enough here to conceive amendments that will keep the bill in committee for the next six months. Gentlemen, I trust that I shall not weary your attention by referring you to the bill itself. Its preamble is this: "A bill to amend the two acts passed in Ireland, for the better education of persons professing the Roman Catholic religion, and for the better government of the seminary established at Maynooth," &c.

"The CHAIRMAN—I beg your pardon; that is the title—not the preamble.

"The Rev. T. D. GREGG—Well, then, in the very title I would propose an amendment: 'and to open the said college for the secular instruction of the public in general;' the object being to guard against the danger likely to arise from the exclusive inculcation of Popish principles. I was delighted to hear a late speaker say, that he had no objection to a measure of general education. The bill does nothing for general education. In the fourth clause provision is made for the salaries of officers and professors, and an increased number of professors; and I think this would be a suitable place to introduce a clause, embodying the principle of that part of the title which I have just read; and, consequently, I would suggest the following amendment for such gentlemen as choose to take it to their representatives. Observe, Mr. Chairman, I do not say, let them copy this amendment; but let them take the spirit of it. 'And whereas, at the time of the Union, the said college was entirely open to Roman Catholics; and whereas a considerable portion of the instruction given therein must necessarily consist of secular learning, &c.; be it therefore enacted, that students of all denominations be admitted to the said college, in order to profit by the said instruction; provided always, that they shall be exempted from all attendance on theological lectures, and on any portion of the Roman Catholic instruction.' Gentlemen, I beg to suggest, that *that* is the very principle which Mr. Shiel is contending for, with regard to Oxford and Cambridge. If, then, we establish a college for Roman Catholics, why should it not be thrown open to Protestants? If through this amendment the bill be defeated, we shall gain our object. The next clause is a clause providing for five hundred students. To that I would add a proviso, to the effect 'that of the two hundred and fifty additional free students, fifty, at the least, should belong to the Protestant churches, should so many apply for admission.'

"The Rev. Dr. REED—Mr. Chairman, might we not redeem time? We all wish, by every constitutional method, to destroy the bill; and it strikes me, that the suggestion of our friend is exceedingly good; but the only way open for us to carry it into effect would be, to request certain gentlemen of this body to wait upon those members who are already pledged, more or less, to the course which is suggested. We could name some dozen friends in the House of Commons, who are prepared, and who have said that they are prepared, by such amendments, to postpone the bill. The practical course would be, for some half dozen of us to get into carriages,

and go from this body, and request them, from us, to do their utmost to effect this object.

"The CHAIRMAN—It occurs to me that the practical course would be, for Mr. Gregg, Mr. Blackburn, and one or two other gentlemen to retire into the committee-room; and to inquire what members might be most advantageously asked to take these steps.

"The Rev. T. POWELL, Wesleyan Minister, from Doncaster—I am very fearful lest the conference should commit itself on a point of great importance—implying that some modification of that bill will be approved by this conference. The bill is too bad to be amended; but, if we propose amendments in it, we shall be committed to a partial approval of its principle.

"The Rev. C. PREST—The suggestion which you have, made sir, is, I think, a good one. Perhaps there would be some difficulty in proposing these amendments in the conference. Some gentlemen had better retire at once. The conference, no doubt, will think that the best thing that could be done is, to defeat the bill altogether; but, if good service can be rendered, by acting on Mr. Gregg's suggestion, it should be done at once.

"The Rev. T. D. GREGG—Mr. Chairman, I am in the hands of the meeting. By your consent, I rose to propose a certain course. I trust I have not violated order, or, in the least degree, hurt the feelings of any gentleman. (Hear, hear.) I beg to say, that I am far from violating the maxim laid down by the reverend gentleman who has just spoken. I would protest against these amendments compromising us into the acceptance of the principle. I conceive that Providence has put the opportunity into our hands of defeating the bill by these measures; and it was with that purpose, and with that view, that I proposed them. This is not doing evil that good may come; for in truth the amendments may be deemed valuable in themselves. The resolution which I would found on the amendments is this:—

"The CHAIRMAN—Gentlemen, I feel quite sure that I can anticipate the feelings of a large proportion of those whom I am addressing. Anything like a resolution to amend the institution would be something like the admission of the principle. (Hear, hear.) And I do not think it would be consistent with our position, as an Anti-Maynooth Conference, to imply that we could tolerate or sanction the institution at all. (Hear, hear.) I think if you (addressing Mr. Gregg) would be so kind as to retire, with two or three gentlemen, and consult with them, it might then be arranged that you and they should go, with the amendments, to certain members of parliament.

"The Rev. J. BLACKBURN—Allow me to say that I have gone over these amendments, and I think they are exceedingly well done to embarrass the bill; but they involve principles which it is utterly impossible to bring before the conference. Some of them are such as I could subscribe, and some of them are such as I could not subscribe; therefore, I submit that we could not enter into them *here*, though it is desirable that we should avail ourselves of Mr. Gregg's suggestion.

"The Rev. G. B. KIDD, from Scarborough—I beg to suggest to the gentlemen who are about to retire, that, if they amend the bill, they should amend it so that not one penny will be given to a Roman Catholic Institution, for any crucifix, or for anything which sanctions idolatry. (Hear, hear.) Unless they can make the bill free from this objection, I should strongly object to their pursuing such a course. I would beg to inquire, whether, in the history of parliamentary proceedings, it has ever been known that a minister has appointed a certain day for an obnoxious measure to be read, and has then taken the reading fourteen days before? If such a thing is unprecedented, I think we should not expect Sir Robert Peel to resort to it. This being the case, we shall not be making our proceedings obnoxious to the country at large, by taking up the time of parliament, and obstructing the private business, and other matters, by a movement, which some in this room do not consider to be necessary?

"The Rev. T. D. GREGG—I rise to order. I think that the gentleman is not speaking to the question.

"The Rev. G. B. KIDD—I think I am speaking to the question. If there is any

gentleman in the room who has sat in parliament, or who has closely watched parliamentary proceedings, I would submit the point to him.

"The Rev. W. BUNTING—Sir Culling, I exceedingly deprecate further discussion on this subject. It would never be decided in a large meeting like this. I beg leave, therefore, to move, that a committee be appointed to confer with Mr. Gregg on this subject. I do hope that, if gentlemen do not agree with us, they will, for the sake of united action, and of preserving that which to us is of unspeakable moment, allow the matter to pass. I will nominate, with your permission, the Rev. J. Kelly, the Rev. W. McIlvaine, the Rev. A. S. Thelwall, &c.

"The Rev. T. D. GREGG—I beg to second the resolution.

"The Rev. T. POWELL—I feel that we are now at a very important point. I should be the last person to throw anything in the way of expedition in business; but I cannot on any account flinch from opposing our taking any part that may get us into a difficulty out of which we may never escape. Upon the point before us, permit me to say that I should suggest the addition of some other persons.

"The CHAIRMAN—Does your objection refer to the nomination of a committee at all, or to the persons appointed?

"The Rev. T. POWELL—To both.

"The CHAIRMAN—Then first address yourself, if you please, to the question of nominating the committee.

"The Rev. Dr. REED—I would beg to propose that the Rev. Mr. Powell be added to the committee. (Hear, hear.)

"The Rev. W. VEYERS—I would beg to remind the meeting that Mr. Gregg is only carrying out the principle recommended by Mr. McNeile, to which the meeting responded—that the Conference were bound to adopt every plan, however apparently factious, for the purpose of procuring the rejection of the bill. I think our thanks are due to Mr. Gregg for bringing this matter forward.

"G. R. PAUL, Esq., of Stroud—There seems to be a slight misunderstanding. My friend was right in supposing that the third reading of the bill is postponed until the 19th of May; but previously it must pass through committee, and that is to be done to-night. (Hear, hear.) Our object is, to prevent its passing to-night through the only stage of which Sir Robert Peel is afraid. *He is afraid of the details.* (Hear, hear.) *The moment you go into details, his party is of such a heterogenous nature, that it immediately breaks up.* It is such a hydra-headed monster, that it must immediately dissolve itself, and break by being divided into different sections. (Hear, hear.) I hope and trust that, whatever amendments may be brought forward, it will not be lost sight of, that the principle upon which we will stand here as Protestants, is that of refusing all grants to Romanism; and—although amendments may be formed which have a tendency to liberalise Maynooth College—yet, if this course will have a tendency to take money from our pockets for a religion which we believe to be superstitious and idolatrous, it cannot be pursued. As a Protestant Conference, we refuse to countenance the Maynooth grant at all. I trust that this will not be forgotten in any amendment which may be proposed.

"The Rev. JABEZ BURNS—I consider this a very critical juncture in our sitting. *If we take a single step in the direction now proposed, we shall be committing ourselves; and I, for one, protest against any such step being taken.* At present we stand right with the whole nation; and the nation is not prepared to go into the intricacies of our movement. If this course be taken, let it be taken by Mr. Gregg, and others who sympathise with him. We shall heartily rejoice if any method can be adopted of delaying or preventing the passing of the bill; but I entreat the conference not to take a single step in this matter.

"The Rev. W. BUNTING read the names of the proposed committee; and, after doing so, said—"And if you please (addressing that gentleman) Mr. Burns?

"The Rev. JABEZ BURNS—*No; I beg leave to move as an amendment, that we take no step in this matter.*

"A DEPUTY—I beg to second that amendment.

"The CHAIRMAN—Gentlemen, it strikes me that no step ought to be taken by this conference, in which we are not unanimous. (Hear, hear.) Therefore, even although

a considerable proportion of our number desire the appointment of the committee, yet, if any object, we should hesitate before we appoint it. And perhaps the same object would be accomplished if the individuals who have been named were to retire, in order that, without any responsibility on our part, this matter may be considered and determined. (Hear, hear.)

"The motion was then withdrawn, and several gentlemen retired from the conference, to reassemble in another room.

"The Rev. JAMES KELLY, of the Established Church—I trust Mr. Chairman, that though we decline as a body of deputies to identify ourselves with this movement, yet amongst us, Mr. Gregg and his friends, who have now retired, will find most anxious co-operators. Some may co-operate most ardently and effectually, notwithstanding what has occurred."

Taking it for granted that the conference was really in earnest in opposing the bill, I could not have anticipated the feeling which my propositions originated. They were warmly, I may say enthusiastically, received by many. Such appeared to be the feeling, for example, of a very distinguished Wesleyan minister, whose name occurs in the above extract, Mr. William Bunting, and the feeling of the clergy present was similar, but the majority seemed to be Dissenting ministers, and these were vociferous in their opposition. According to their doctrine, the government had no right to interfere with religion at all, good or bad; hence, if we asked Parliament to do what was right with respect to Maynooth College, though it might defeat the bill, still it would concede the principle of religious interference on the part of the State—that is, it would concede the principle of an Established Church—a concession which Dissenters would not make, even though it might have cast out the ministerial measure. Thus the conference rejected my propositions; its proceedings evaporated in the merest talk, tiresome, uninteresting, and totally unconnected with practical results, and Sir Robert Peel carried his bill almost with acclamation. The gentlemen who were "to die on the floor of the House, rather than allow the measure to pass," did not offer it five minutes' delay; and all their boasting on the subject turned out to be mere boastful nonsense.

On the evening of the day on which my propositions were thus rejected, I went down to the House of Commons, and was accosted in the lobby of the House by a gentleman quite a stranger to me, who with much interest asked how my propositions had, upon my retirement from the meeting, been dealt with by the members of the Conference who accompanied me. I told him that I feared nothing effectual had been done, a statement which he seemed to hear with a good deal of disappointment. In reply to an inquiry which I made, he informed me that he was Mr. Telle-mache, member for Cheshire, and he did me the favour of introducing me to several members of the House, whom I severally intreated to act in the way which I proposed. Not presuming to say that they should adopt the language of my amendments, unless they quite approved of it, but that proceeding upon the principle proposed, they should insert on the books, notices of amendment of some sort or other, and thus protract the threatened evil. I myself put amendments into the hands of many members, and a similar course was adopted by several who were friendly to the course which I advised, amongst them my MS. was dispersed. I looked with a great deal of interest into the *Times* of the next morning, to see the notices of motion which might have been expected—nothing had been done. No doubt, the rejection of the proposition by the Conference had a paralysing effect upon the Members of Parliament. The Rev. Mr. Thelwall, who compiled and edited the "Proceedings of the Anti-Maynooth Conference," in his historical introduction to that work, has the following observations:—

"Various amendments were proposed, and several divisions took place upon particular clauses of the bill. But the same determination in opposing the bill *within the House*, was not manifested, which was so evidently felt *out of the House*—or, which was, indeed, expected by many. It had been said, that there were *twelve men* who were determined rather to die on the floor of the House than suffer the

bill to pass: but the opposition which was made in committee did not exhibit anything of this determined spirit. The circumstance (it was thought by many) would have warranted the utmost extent of such opposition, as would, in another case, have been most justly considered factions—as was ably stated by the Rev. H. McNeile, at the first meeting of the conference, (see Report, pp. 15, 16,) and the Rev. T. D. Gregg had shown much ability in drawing up a series of amendments, the discussion of which would have brought out the iniquity of the measure—and would have occupied the House of Commons until now, had members been disposed to take them up. (See Report, pp. 115—120.) But, perhaps it required *superhuman* fortitude to take such a decided stand, and to persevere in such a determined course as was thus marked out—especially when the present constitution and temper of the House of Commons are taken into consideration.”

If the amendments which I proposed involved the slightest compromise of hostility to the principle of the bill, it would have been wise and well to have rejected them, but they did nothing of the sort. The bill, however amended, would still have to pass through a third reading, when all those opposed to it might have recorded their votes, both against the principle and against the details. The introduction of the amendments was merely intended to force the consideration of details, for to appropriate the language of Mr. Paul, of Stroud, “Sir Robert Peel was afraid of the details; his party was of such a heterogeneous nature, that if forced into details, it would immediately have been broken up;” to protract the bill, to gain time, and to increase the opposition by which the measure was encountered in the country, was the object, and this was frustrated—why? Why, because we were joined with those who thought it unprincipled to solicit parliament even to do what was right, if it involved any interference with religion.

Brought strongly to my mind as the above circumstances were by the reception of Mr. Thelwall's book, and forced as I was thereby to the conclusion, that the enactment of the disastrous Maynooth Bill was in some sort traceable to our union with the Dissenters in opposing it, my hope of our making any great progress towards Christian union by uniting with Dissenters to obtain it—a hope which I confess, I was at one time led to entertain, was greatly lessened.

Page 390.

I have lately been reading a book which has just issued from the American press, entitled, “Auricular Confession, and Popish Nunneries;” the author is William Hogan, Esq., a member of the American bar, formerly a Roman Catholic priest. Nothing can be more appalling than the view which he gives of the deep-seated demoralisation connected with Popery. He speaks from his own experience as a priest, and he states facts, which, if they be true, should make it the first business of a Christian Legislature to devote itself to the eradication of Popery, and would render it a high crime against Almighty God, and against society, to afford it any, the slightest countenance. If we are to believe Mr. Hogan (and his book is introduced by testimonials to his character of the highest kind), the virtue that we very generally attribute to the Romish priesthood, and the chaste conversation that we imagine to be connected with their instructions, however erroneous in point of principle these instructions may be, are the merest delusion. He positively avers that there is nothing of the kind in existence; that every nunnery is a seraglio, and Roman Catholic priests, almost without exception, debauchees. And this in Ireland! for the author is an Irishman, and was educated at Maynooth. The details that he gives of *his own knowledge*, derived from the confessional, are, beyond description, startling and frightful. He commences his pamphlet by a statement of the

causes that made him doubt the infallibility of the Romish Church, and speaks thus :—

"I have often been asked, why did you leave the Roman Catholic Church? However painful the relation, however heavy the narrative may fall upon Roman priests and bishops, and disreputable to nuns and nunneries, I will answer the question frankly. Several causes induced me to doubt the infallibility of the Romish Church, and to renounce its ministry altogether. Amongst the first was the following :—

"When quite young, and but just emerged from childhood, I became acquainted with a Protestant family living in the neighbourhood of my birth-place. It consisted of a mother, (a widow lady,) and three interesting children—two sons and one daughter. The mother was a widow, a lady of great beauty and rare accomplishments. The husband, who had but recently died, one of the many victims of what is falsely called honour, left her, as he found her, in the possession of a large fortune, and, as far as worldly goods could make her so, in the enjoyment of perfect happiness. But his premature death threw a gloom over her future life, which neither riches nor wealth, nor all worldly comforts combined together, could effectually dissipate. Her only pleasure seemed to be placed in that of her children. They appeared, and I believe they really were, the centre and circumference of her earthly happiness.

"In the course of time the sons grew up, and their guardians purchased for both, in compliance with their wishes, and to gratify their youthful ambition, commissions in the army. The parting of these children, the breaking up of this fond trio of brothers and sister, was to the widowed mother another source of grief, and tended to concentrate, if possible more closely, all the fond affections of the mother upon her daughter. She became the joy of her heart. Her education, while a child, was an object of great solicitude; and having a fortune at her command, no expense was spared to render it suitable for that station in life in which her high connexions entitled her to move, when she should become of age. The whole family were members of the Protestant Church, as the Episcopal Church is called in that country. As soon as the sons left home to join their respective regiments, which were then on the continent, the mother and daughter were much alone; so much so, that the fond mother soon discovered that her too great affection for her child, and the indulgence given to her, were rather impeding than otherwise her education. She accordingly determined to remove her governess, who up to this period was her sole instructor, under the watchful eye of the fond and accomplished mother herself, and send her to a fashionable school for young ladies. There was then in the neighbourhood, only about twenty miles from this family, a nunnery of the order of Jesuits. To this nunnery was attached a school, superintended by nuns of that order. The school was one of the most fashionable in the country; the nuns who presided over it were said to be the most accomplished teachers in Europe. The expenses of an education in it were extravagantly high, but not beyond the reach of wealth and fashion. The mother, though a Protestant, and strict and conscientious in the discharge of all the duties of her church, and not without a struggle in parting with her child, and consigning her to the charge of Jesuits, yielded in this case to the malign influence of *fashion*, as many a fond mother does, even in this our own land, of equal and far-famed, though mock equality—sent her beautiful daughter, her earthly idol, to the school of these nuns. Let the result speak for itself.

"Up to the departure of the sons for the army, and this daughter for the nunnery, I had been even from my infancy acquainted with this family, and had for them the highest respect and warmest attachment. The elder brother was about my own age, and only a few years between the eldest and the youngest child.

"Soon after the daughter was sent to school, I entered the College of Maynooth as a theological student; and in due time was ordained a Roman Catholic priest, by particular *dispensation*, being two years under the canonical age. An interval of some years passed before I had an opportunity of meeting my young friend again: our interview was under peculiar circumstances. I was ordained a Romish priest, and located where she happened to be on a visit. There was a large party given, at which, among many others, I happened to be present; and there meeting with

my friend, and interchanging the usual courtesies upon such occasions, she—sportively, as I then imagined—asked me whether I would preach her reception sermon, as she intended becoming a nun, and taking the white veil. Not even dreaming of such an event, I replied in the affirmative. I heard no more of the affair for about two months, when I received a note from her designating the chapel, the day, and the hour she expected me to preach. I was then but a short time in the ministry, but sufficiently long to know that up to the hour of my commencing to read Popish theology, especially that of *Dens* and *Astoisne de Peccatis*, I knew nothing of the iniquities taught and practised by Romish priests and bishops.

“On the receipt of my friend’s note, a cold chill crept over me; I anticipated, I feared, I trembled, I felt there must be foul play somewhere. However, I went according to promise, preached her reception sermon at the request of the young lady, and with the special approbation of the bishop, whom I had to consult on such occasions.

“The concourse of people that assembled on this occasion was very great. The interest created by the apparent voluntary retirement from the world of one so young, so wealthy, and so beautiful, was intense, and accordingly the chapel in which I preached was filled to overflowing, with the nobility and fashionables of that section of the country. Many and large were the tears that were shed when this beautiful young lady cut off her rich and flowing tresses of hair.

“You may, therefore, easily judge from her immolation upon the altar of fanaticism, or, more properly speaking, her personal sacrifice to the idol of Popish and Jesuit lust, the nature of that feeling which such an event must have produced in the mind of every Christian believer.

“Having no clerical connexion with the convent in which she was immured, I had not seen her for three months following. At the expiration of that time, one of the lay-sisters of the convent delivered to me a note; I knew it contained something startling.

“These lay-sisters among Jesuits are spies belonging to that order, but are sometimes bribed by the nuns for certain purposes. As soon as I reached my apartments, I found that my young friend expressed a wish to see me on something important. I, of course, lost no time in calling on her, and, being a priest, I was immediately admitted; but never have I forgot, nor can I forget, the melancholy picture of lost beauty and fallen humanity, which met my astonished gaze, in the person of my once beautiful and virtuous friend. I had been then about eighteen months a Romish priest, and was not without some knowledge of their prodigal lives; and, therefore, I was the better prepared for, and could more easily anticipate, what was to come. After such preliminary conversation as may be expected upon occasions of this kind, the young lady spoke to me to the following effect, if not literally so. I say *literally*, because so deep, and strong, and lasting was the impression made upon my mind, that I believe I have not forgotten one letter of her words.

“‘I sent for you, my friend, to see you once more before my death. I have insulted my God, and disgraced my family. I am in the *familyway*, and I must die!’ After a good deal of conversation, which it is needless to repeat, I discovered from her confession the parent of this pregnancy, and that the *Mother Abbess* of the convent advised her to take medicine which would effect abortion; but that she knew from the lay-sister who delivered me the note, and who was a confidential servant in the convent, that the medicine which the Mother Abbess would give her, would contain poison, and that the procuring abortion was a mere pretext. I gave her such advice as I could in the capacity of a Romish priest. I advised her to send for the bishop. ‘I cannot do it,’ said she, ‘my destroyer is my confessor.’ I was silent. I had no more to say. I was bound by oath to be true to him. In vain did the noble sentiment even of the Pagan occur to me; a sentiment sanctioned almost by inspiration itself. It fled from my mind as smoke before the wind. I was one of the priests of the *infallible church*, and what was honour, what was honesty to me, where the honour of this infallible church was concerned? They were of no account; not worthy the consideration of a *Romish Priest* for a second.

The almost heavenly sentiment of the noble Pagan, 'Fiat justitia, ruat cælum,' 'Let justice be done, even if the heavens were to fall,' fled from my mind. I retired, leaving my friend to her fate, but promising at her request, to return in a fortnight.

"According to promise, I did return in a fortnight, but the foul deed was done. She was no more! The cold clay contained in its dread embrace all that now remained of that being who, but a few months before, lived and moved in all the beauty and symmetry of proportion; and that soul, once so pure, which a fond mother confided to the care of Jesuit nuns, had been driven in its guilt and pollution into the presence of a just and merciful God. All, all, the work of Jesuits and nuns."

So shocking an event might well shake his faith in the system which not only allowed of its occurrence, but was framed with the express purpose of shielding it from execration, and securing it with impunity. The experience of Mr. Hogan would lead to the conclusion, that facts of a kindred character are, in the Popish system, not the exception but the rule. His book very naturally, therefore, constitutes a stirring appeal to the American people, calling on them utterly to exclude from all political influence the subjects of the Pope—to abolish nunneries, as constituting in truth so many brothels; and it predicts ruin to American liberty, if the warnings and the admonitions of the author be disregarded. Without any inclination to go the length to which he would lead his readers, what he has said is quite sufficient to impress the mind most strongly with a sense of the excessive criminality involved in lending to Popish principle that support for which our governments have lately become responsible, or of failing to take, in opposing it, that decided tone which distinguished the era of the Reformation, which is sanctioned by both the letter and the spirit of the Bible and of the Church, and yet which is, at the same time, so much at variance with the spirit of the present age.

Page 408.

The following copy of a petition from the Dublin Protestant Association, shows how an organisation for procuring the adoption of the policy required should work.

"To the Honourable the House of Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament Assembled, the Humble Petition of the undersigned Citizens of Dublin, and others, members and friends of the Protestant Association and Reformation Society of Dublin.

"HUMBLY SHEWETH,—

"That your petitioners are afflicted with grief and concern, and in many cases brought beneath the pressure of very great distress.

"That they believe the displeasure of Almighty God to be resisting on the Kingdom, and fear, in consequence, that those national disasters, which all history shows to be productive of the downfall of states, will overwhelm the State of Britain, unless averted by a speedy return to the paths of truth and righteousness.

"That your petitioners think it their bounden duty to their country, to their children, to themselves, and to your honourable House, as the great council of the nation, to testify to your honourable House of the pain and grief which afflict them at the contemplation of the existing state of things; and to entreat and supplicate your honourable House to ponder upon the statements which your petitioners herein set forth; and if your honourable House find them to be true according to Scripture, to adopt them as such, and to act accordingly, and to vouchsafe a favourable assent to the prayer of your petitioners.

"That the cause of the concern, the anxiety, the pain and grief of your petitioners, is the departure from sound principle which has of late taken place in the national councils, and which is, alas ! (as in the particulars hereinafter set forth doth appear) at present made the rule of the national policy.

"That your petitioners cannot but apprehend that speedy ruin must follow, unless this disregard of principle be abandoned, and a course of conduct totally different be entered on and persevered in.

"That there is an ancient system of false religion in the world called Popery, which has been expressly pointed out in the Word of God himself as the source of all the moral evils which afflict the Church. (Rev. xvii. 5.) That this corrupt system formerly prevailed over the whole Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, sinking the people into the depths of degradation. That the real character of the system having become known to our fathers, led them not only to throw it off themselves but to erect against it a monument in the archives of the State, in order to prevent it from any future period beguiling the people into that apostasy from Christ and rebellion against the Divine Majesty, which had previously involved them in such dire calamities.

"That the venerable testimonies against Popery here alluded to, to wit, the Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy of the Church, are still incorporated in the laws, form the acknowledged principles of the nation, and are undeniably true according to Scripture.

"That the oaths of supremacy and abjuration which have been taken by the monarch, by most of the members of your honourable House, and the great functionaries of the State, most truly pronounce two of the leading dogmas of Popery to be altogether false and unfounded.

"That the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church established by law, condemn as erroneous all the peculiar Articles of the Church of Rome, and pronounce most truly that the very essence of the Romish worship, "the sacrifices of masses," are blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits (Article 31) ; and that the "Book of Homilies," which are also incorporated with the laws, which books your petitioners have been instructed in from their youth up, and which they do most firmly hold, believe, and maintain, declare that the aforesaid system of Popery is wholly opposed to the revealed Word of God, and destructive of the happiness, the liberties, and the best interests of mankind. Thus, then, do the fundamental laws of the State, which, as British subjects and citizens, your Petitioners are bound to venerate, and which also as Protestants they have ascertained from Scripture to be true, hold up Popery to the view of your petitioners as a system that is, as aforesaid, opposed to the Word of God, destructive to the souls of men, and subversive of the best interests of society. The very same identical laws which teach your petitioners to shun sedition and blood-shedding, burglary, arson, and rebellion, teach them also to shun idolatry, blasphemy, superstition, and false religion in general, but especially the false system of Popery.

"Your petitioners would most humbly, but most earnestly, impress it on your honourable House, that they have identically the very same reasons for abhorring Popery as they have for abhorring robbery, murder, and all sorts of lawless violence—that is to say, reasons derived from the Word of God and his Church, and from the sanctions of British law. As your petitioners must think that your honourable House believes the Word of God, and desire the obedience of your petitioners, and of the subjects of the realm in general, "for conscience sake," then they entreat your honourable House to let the obedience that is rendered to that Word be universal, and to save them from the pain of seeing it desecrated, despised, and trampled on, in some of its most important sanctions.

"Hence, petitioners most humbly pray your honourable House to deal with respect to Popery in a manner that shall be consistent with the fundamental laws—that is to say, to treat it as a system of error, falsehood, and superstition. How unchristian it is to have men instructed in the principles of error—nay, to have them educated in order to be teachers of error themselves—must be seen at a glance ; yet this is the object of the Royal College of Maynooth. Your petitioners most humbly

pray your honourable House to withdraw from that Institution any and every possible kind of support, whatsoever that may be given by the National money. If your honourable House would shrink from the support of an establishment designed to inculcate the baneful principles of Socialism, why not much more from that of one where Popery is taught? inasmuch as it is evident that Popery is a system as baneful in its results, and infinitely more deep-rooted and subtle in its nature than Socialism can be.

"In like manner your petitioners humbly pray that the National Schools of Ireland may be conducted on a system intended and calculated to eradicate the superstitions of Popery, and that no arrangements may be allowed in such schools having for their object the leaving of the errors of Popery, or any other errors whatsoever, uncorrected. Your petitioners pray your honourable House to make the National Schools of Ireland be distinguished by a paramount attention to, and reverence for, the Word of God.

"Your petitioners also pray your honourable House to present an address to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, that Her Majesty may be pleased to command the Most Rev. the Archbishops, and the Right Rev. the Bishops of the Established Church, to have especial preachers appointed publicly to expose the evils of Popery, and to exhort all Her Majesty's subjects to abandon the aforesaid corrupt system; and they further pray your honourable House to deliberate upon other measures, calculated to eradicate the said system, and thus to avert from the country the wrath of the Almighty. Petitioners would humbly suggest to your honourable House that an examination of Divines, learned in the Word of God, and a diligent study of the Word itself, would, under the Divine blessing, lead your honourable House, in your wisdom, to understand the best mode of proceeding in the premises.

"Your petitioners entirely deprecate anything resembling severity to the persons of Papists, their desires being confined to an exposition of the evils of Popery considered as a system. They would, however, again and again, most earnestly beseech and respectfully supplicate your honourable House to consider how subversive it must be of the faith, and therefore of the morals and social virtues of the community, and how calculated to draw down on the land the heavy wrath of the Almighty, that the National Councils should be seen setting at nought the solemn sanctions of the Divine Word, and treating with equal favour the Professors of an ascertained Apostasy, and the believers in the faith of the holy Catholic Church—expending the National money to instruct the subjects of the crown in the principles of a false and anti-christian system, and also to propagate its errors far and wide.

"Most humbly beseeching your honourable House to act in the premises in the manner most humbly set forth herein, that is to say, to withdraw all public support from the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth, and from all Roman Catholic ecclesiastics at home or abroad, to render the Irish system of education strictly Scriptural, and to adopt measures publicly to expose the errors of Popery, and thereby eradicate the system, which only stands through the indulgence shown to its errors.

"Your petitioners will ever pray."

NOTES.

Page 18.—“*Being convinced in my own mind, that a clergyman who was not duly licensed could not do so as of right.*”

When I gave this opinion, I was disposed to think that, according to the canons of the church, orders alone could not be considered as entitling a clergyman to preach an occasional sermon for a brother clergyman without the license or formal permission of the bishop for such preaching had and obtained. I confess myself, however, to have been led by the very able work of the Rev. R. J. M'Ghee, entitled “Episcopal and Clerical Duty and Responsibility considered,” to doubt the correctness of this idea. Mr. M'Ghee shows beyond any question, that the “license to preach,” which is spoken of in the canons, does not mean “episcopal license,” but “license had from the Lord Chancellor”—a species of license now fallen into utter desuetude, but which was formerly rendered necessary by the existence within the church of covert and disaffected Papists, who promulgated from the pulpit rebellion against the authorities. At the time that the canons were adopted, the precaution taken by the “license to preach,” spoken of in them, was essentially necessary; and the conference of that license could not safely be trusted even to the bishops, for of them also some were infected by the too prevalent spirit of Popery. So far, therefore, was the privilege of licensing preachers from having been placed in their hands, that they themselves required that very license—to wit, the Lord Chancellor’s license—in order to the exercise of the function. This view is developed in an exceedingly able and learned manner, in the work to which I refer; and the position which it establishes is not only not doubtful, but it was distinctly admitted as sound by Dr. Miller, of Armagh, in a legal judgment which he delivered, where the question of this prerogative was tried. Referring to Mr. M'Ghee’s work, he admitted the correctness of the facts laid down by him, and the soundness of the reasoning founded on them; and thence that the privilege of “licensing to preach,” could not be claimed by the bishops from *canon law*. Nevertheless, he asserted that that privilege was established by custom, and that thence it could not properly be gained. Perhaps, the reader may be disposed to say, that this is “six of one and half a dozen of the other,” for it practically comes to the same point whether episcopal prerogative be based on written or canon law, or on custom, or common law. Granting all this, there may still be great weight in Mr. M'Ghee’s argument. For who can tell that the *custom*, which is now pleaded, may not have grown out of the misapprehension which his work explodes? This, I must say, seems to me highly probable; and the consideration may be of great weight, should it come to be pondered on by right-minded prelates of wisdom and power, who feel disposed to think that the liberty of the church may be of greater importance than the maintenance of a prerogative which was originally founded on a mistake, and insisted on, perhaps, through lust of power.

Page 34.—“*The last twelfth of July,*” &c.

On the 12th of July, 1845, which is here referred to, the Orangemen of the North assembled in vast numbers at Lisburne to commemorate the great victories of William the Third, of which that day is generally considered the anniversary; for it was on the 12th of July that the battle of Anghrim was fought and won by that monarch of glorious memory. James Watson, Esq., Deputy Lieutenant and Justice of the Peace, placed himself at the head of the vast array, and by his influence secured the maintenance of the most perfect peace and order—for this he was dismissed immediately after by Sir Robert Peel!!! On the first of the same month, the Protestants of Dublin commemorated the victory of the Boyne; and on the 12th of August following, the Orangemen of Enniskillen and the region round about, in countless thousands stood forth to testify their devotion to the cause of truth and to the best interests of Ireland. An expression in an address to the Queen, which they adopted on the occasion, was memorable. They distinctly told her Majesty, did these Enniskilleners, that they would “resist to the death the establishment of Popery in Ireland.” Her Majesty may depend on it that they spoke the truth.

Page 42.—“*The case is so notorious, and so recent,*” &c.

A false charge of stabbing a Roman Catholic was brought against three Protestants, who attended the meeting at the Rotundo Gardens, Dublin, on the 1st of July, 1845. The men were fully acquitted of the charge, though under the circumstances alluded to in the statement here given.

Page 254.—“*It is a mediation between heaven and earth,*” &c.

The passage here referred to will be found in Massillon's Sermon, very appropriately entitled, “*Discours Sur L'Ambition des Clercs.*” “*Sermons de Massillon.*” 8vo. Paris, MDCCCLXXVI., Vol. I., pp. 94, 95; complete in fifteen volumes.

Page 279.—“*As a specimen of the weakness,*” &c.

I had no idea, when I commented as I did in this place on the sophistical reasoning of Dr. Todd, that that reasoning had not originated with himself. How did it astonish me to find, in looking over an old work entitled, “*The Man of Sin,*” by “*No Roman, but a Reformed Catholic*” (London, 1687), that the Doctor had merely acted the part of a retailer of another man's wares in the charge of absurdity which he brought against the Protestant view. In fact, the argument on which Dr. Todd relies, is an old and exploded sophism of the Jesuit, Cardinal Bellarmine! In the work to which I refer, the old writer thus takes up the point made by the Cardinal, and laughs it to scorn:—“*The Jesuit [Bellarmine] hath another card to play, and that's a trump; look to it, for out it comes, thus: ‘Anti-Christ sits in the Church [so Protestants argue]: ergo, the Pope sits in the church. But the church is only one: ergo, Protestants, who have departed from the Pope, are out of the church.*’*” Oh! how the good man smiles to see what a rod we have made for our own breech; and let the Pope but have the laying of it on, I warrant we feel it. Well, but 'twill fetch no blood. How fine soever the argument runs, 'tis but a pleasant dream. For do we not read of a ‘church at Corinth,’ ‘the church of the

* Bellarmine de Rom. P. lib. 3. cap. 13.

Thessalonians,' 'the Church of Galatia,' and seven in Asia, whatever were elsewhere more, beside that of Rome? So that the Pope may sit without us in the church until he be cold again, and we find room enough in some one or other church to keep us warm the while. And if this should not serve the turn, Protestants are not such babies to be choused with counters, instead of guineas; nor Papists so lucky as to fob them off with a compounded for a divided sense, though many a thing duller may go off cleverly at home. We do contend that it is the Church of God where Antichrist sits, that is when he mounts the throne; but, alas! 'tis quickly worse for his wearing of it. Nay, his long sitting there does utterly mar it, though it keeps the name still: so doth the beggar call it still 'that coat which such a gentleman gave him,' when 'tis so patched that not one piece of the first stuff can be seen upon it. What if a man should say the Roman Bishop sitteth on the Emperor's throne?—'twere very truth; but would it therefore follow that Rome were *now* the Emperor's, where he hath neither one foot of ground, nor any grain of authority left him? No, but all men in their wits would quickly understand that the meaning was, 'It was so once, until that crafty fox had wiped his nose on't.' Thus Royal palaces are found to keep their ancient names, when they are turned to ruins. Even so it is still 'the church where Antichrist sitteth.' Once *thing*, once *name*; now *name*, and nothing more. 'How is the faithful city become a harlot?' saith the Prophet. What! a 'faithful city,' yet 'a harlot,' too? So once she *was*, so now she *is*. And in the New Testament how frequently do such passages occur! 'The blind see,' 'the deaf hear,' 'the dumb speak,' 'the lame walk,' and 'the dead live,' where very children know 'tis meant they were so, but the case is altered. Wives keep their husbands' names, though they justly suffer a divorce for whoredom. And thus it fares with Antichrist's seat. Rome *was* God's temple, and Christ's church; it *is* the Devil's synagogue, and the conventicle of the Pope, but beareth still the name of church and Christian, also." (*Man of Sin*, pp. 39, 40.)

Does it not greatly enhance the unfaithfulness, from the guilt of which I know not how Dr. Todd can be exculpated, that he should be thus found giving currency to the malignant objections of the Jesuits against Protestantism, without ever once warning his readers of the source from which he draws, or stating to them the nature of those answers, so full and so convincing, by which the view prevalent in his church has been maintained? The reader cannot, I am sure, avoid being struck with the fact, that the sophism of the Jesuit, and the same when employed by Dr. Todd, affected with precisely similar feelings the anonymous writer, "No Roman, but a Reformed Catholic," and the author of the present work, and led both into something like similar train of thought and comment.

Page 283.— "*Rome is either the pillar and the ground of truth, or she is Antichrist.*"

This sentiment of Mr. Newman may involve, in its construction, a good deal of craft. Certainly it is often enough said in a loose and general way, that Popery is the great Antichrist; it must, however, be obvious to every one that, strictly speaking, such language is incorrect, and could only be justified upon the ground that it was merely intended to convey that Popery was Antichristian; for the term Antichrist in Scripture is obviously considered as applicable to an individual, a person, a man, and is not in strictness of speaking, capable of being interpreted of a *system*. If Mr. Newman, therefore, conceived his statement with the understanding that he might evade its *primâ facie* force, by a contest about words and the propriety of their usage, he played a shrewd game. In the current language of our more ancient divines, the Pope is almost universally identified with Antichrist; and this is an application of the term against which no verbal exception would lie, nor in point of fact do I think that *any* objection to the phraseology could be sustained. I am well aware that Faber, and some other highly respectable divines, have objected to the application of the term to the Pope, but after the most anxious consideration of the arguments advanced by them, I see no valid reason for a departure from the universal

language of the Reformers. It is quite certain that the repudiation of the phraseology in question would stultify the Reformed Church, and in doing this, would afford a plausible ground of triumph to Papists. I am aware that this would afford no valid reason for adhering to a form of speech which was in itself incorrect. It would appear, however, capable of affording to every one who has a due respect for the voice of the Church, and who properly appreciates the wisdom of the Reformers (those great deliverers of Christendom) some reason for thinking that what the Church and the Reformers universally agreed upon, was not likely to constitute a groundless calumny — a calumny which would evidence on their part a silly malignity, and would challenge for the ancient patriarch who would thus appear to have been made the object of a rash and unjustifiable condemnation, no small amount of general sympathy.

INDEX.

- A**
- Absurdity of Dr. Todd's reasoning, 280.
 "Act against the authority of the Bishop of Rome," 386.
 Act of Uniformity, 335.
 ———, Rev. Hugh M'Neile's opinion on 339.
 Admission of lay help in the church, 338.
 ——— would dry up the springs of dissent, 339.
 Adoption of the creed of Pope Pius IV., 289.
 ——— marks not the beginning, but the approaching downfall of the Apostasy, 290.
 Advertisement, A curious 233.
 A glorious work before us, 105.
 "A great idea" from Popery, 402.
 ——— glanced at, 403.
 Albigenses (The) 272.
 Alliance, Evangelical 340.
 America, its case not applicable to England, 363.
 Andover workhouse, England in a ferment about 78.
 Anglican church (The) possesses marks of a true Christian church, 186.
 An honest man *not* the noblest work of God, 28.
 Answer of a supposed Romish priest to Mr. M'Ghee, 154.
 Antichrist, The Pope is called by grave authorities, 118, 268—273.
 Apathy in Ireland, 41.
 Anti-state church madness, 361.
 Apostasy, its Duration, 268.
 ———, its Marks, 246, 253.
 ———, Prophecy of a great 228.
 ———, Popery is the great foretold 230.
 ———, Popery should be attacked as the great 124.
 ——— simultaneous with the false prophet of the East, 257.
 ——— (The) condemnable by the Word of God, 255.
 ——— prodigious, 257.
 ——— remarkable for the separation from it of faithful souls, 257.
 ——— was to grow great by the power of kings, 258.
 Apostasy's (The) seat or see is Rome, 258.
 Apostate church, 315.
 Apostolic church (An) may be schismatical, 320.
 Apostolic connexion of the Archbishop of Armagh, 218.
 ——— of Canterbury, 220.
 Apostolicity implies non-separation and derived constitution, 195.
 Apostolicity of the Anglican church, 193.
 Aquinas, Thomas 176.
 Archbishop of Dublin and the Author, 10.
 ———'s inhibition, 15.
 Archbishops of Armagh since St. Patrick, their history, 197—217.
 A retrospect, 18.
 "Arran Fisherman's (The) dead child," 300.
 Articles and Homilies of the Church, their tone bold and strong, 366.
 Articles (The Thirty nine) novel in form only, 158.
 ——— (True and false) placed in juxtaposition, 163.
 Arts (The) not parentally nursed by the monks, 77.
 Association, Repeal 80.
 ———, The Protestant 79, 176.
 Audacity whilom of Father Maguire, 11.
 Augustine's (Saint) saying quoted by an Irish priest, 137, referred to, 148.
 Austria, Imposing sacrifice of the mass in, 401.
 Austria, Popish, 27.
 Austria, Submission of the people in 27.
 Author's orthodox status, 18.
 Author (The) about 1400 years of age, 24.
 ——— a Tory, 26.
 ——— not for theoretic speculations, 6.
 ——— often reproached for plain speaking, 116.
 ——— once inclined to Liberalism, 171.
 ———, Religious history of 173.
 ——— peculiar ecclesiastic status, 16.
 ——— first reply to the priest, 126.
 ——— second reply, 128.
 Author, Priests' reply to the 137.
 Author's (The) plain speaking often reproved, 115.
 ——— popularity after the discussion, 13.

- visit to the parish church of Leeds, 223.
Auto da fe writ on Cranmer, 253.
- B**
- "Babylon is its name," [Rome's] 256.
 Bacon, Lord 76.
 "Battle of the Boyne," 306.
 Battle of the church improperly fought, 313.
 Bear's grease, 348.
 Before the Reformation, Testimony against Rome, 272.
 "Beggar's (The) noviciate," 300.
 Bible (The) a miraculous book, 5.
 Bible, The Douay 268.
 Bill of Rights, 96.
 — the offspring of Protestantism, 104.
 Bishop Burnett, 100, 109.
 — of London and the Duke of Wellington, 91.
 — of Mentz to Con O'Nial, 416.
 — Timothy, of the Ephesians, 194.
 — Titus, of Crete, 194.
 — Wilson, (of Calcutta,) 194.
 Bishops in Parliament, We have 398.
 "Blasphemy and spiritual pride," a mark of the Apostasy, 254.
 "Blind girl (The) at the holy well," 300.
 Board of Commissioners (Her Majesty's) for regulating and improving the condition of the working classes, 403.
 — colonising waste lands, 404.
 — the promotion of Christian knowledge, 404.
 — for the regulation of factory labour, 406.
 — for the religious instruction of the Irish in their native language, 407.
 Bondage, the spirit of Popery, 85.
 Bones of Wickliffe, 265.
 Boniface III., 260.
Bonus Pastor, the Bull, 176.
 Book (The) of Revelation against Popery, 252.
 "Bouchelleen Bawn," 305.
 Bradford, John 152, 271.
 British Cabinet (The) should be composed of men of peace, 89.
 British constitution, A notion of the Duke of Wellington antagonistic to the spirit of the 87.
 British freedom, Results of Protestantism on, 107.
 British liberty, 86.
 — State nearly unchristianised by Wellington, 91.
 British Lion (The) 380.
 Browne, Hon. Dennis 178.
 Bunyan was a divine, 266.
 Burgh, Mr. William 118, 265.
- C.**
- Cabinet (British) should be composed of men of peace, 89.
Cena Domini, the Bull, 176.
 Cairlan, 199.
 "Calendar of Prophecy," Faber's 159.
 Calvin, 273, 329, 365.
 Cant of clergymen shrinking from political matters, 43.
 Carlike, 51.
 Caroline, Queen 51.
 Catholic and Apostolic Church, The 317.
 Catholics (Irish Roman) are Wauchobites, 327.
 — (Roman) seem public spirited, 80.
 Cause of extrinsic Protestant divisions, 331.
 "Celibacy," 258.
 Celibacy, Sir James Graham's "enlightened" notions on 390.
 Characteristic of Popery, Slavery is a 78.
 Character of the times, indifference to religion, 845.
 Charity in all things, Let us have 167, Charles I., 84.
 Christ, (Institution of) at variance with theory of Independents, 196.
 — riding to Jerusalem, 351.
 — "a mark of the Apostasy," "Virtual denial of 256.
 Christian ordinances appeal to the understanding, 850.
 Christian liberty (Restrictions on) an excuse for schism, 332.
 Christianity abolishes carnal forms, 225.
 — operates on the *soul* of man, 349.
 —, Tractarians mistake the genius of 225.
 Christian knowledge, Her Majesty's Board of Commissioners for the promotion of 404.
 Christian men should be active citizens, 84.
 — rulers servants of the people, 75.
 Christians' duty to sanctify the state, 123.
 Christians' mission, 45.
 Christian union not an agreement in disunion, 340.
 Church, Admission of lay helps in the 338.
 — (Admission of lay helps in the) would dry up the springs of dissent, 339.
 —, Dr. Todd knowingly against the 274.
 —, Dr. Todd opposes the Catholic or universal opinion of his 277.
 —, its claims based on reason, 364.
 Churches, Multiplicity of 314.
 — (Reformed) 318.
 —, (Protestant and Roman Catholic) proposal for their reconciliation, 124.
 — which never submitted to Rome, 318.

- Church property not public, 362.
 — (Free) in Swift's-alley, 9, why so
 denominated, 15.
 Church, Intrinsic divisions of the 364.
 —, its evils, 343.
 — of the Apostles was distinguished
 for zeal, energy, and purity, 258.
 — of Christ described, 185.
 — of England system never been
 worked out, 46.
 Church (The) guards against false brethren,
 371.
 — of Ireland, *Status* of the 221.
 Church (The), its Articles and Homilies,
 366.
 — of Rome (The) has a *sense* of
 Scripture, 155.
 — of Scotland (The) agrees with the
 Church of England concerning Popery,
 269.
 — property equitably held, 24.
 —, Scottish Episcopal, Query—schis-
 matical? 321.
 —, Marks of a Christian 186.
 — (The Roman) originally pure, 29.
 — (The) the keeper of Holy Writ, 222.
 — (The) teaches a noble lesson of
 liberality, 45.
 —, Traditions of the 34th Article on the
 192.
 Circumstance (Remarkable) 180.
 "City of Jackeens," Newspaper epithet,
 78.
 Claims of the church based on reason, 364.
 Clarke (Adam), his employment on the pub-
 lic records, 104.
 Cobbett, 102.
 — had his use, 108.
 Cobbett's "History of the Reformation,"
 102.
 Colonel Blaquiére, 179.
 — Hutchinson, 178.
 — J. Wood, 71.
 Colonising waste lands, Her Majesty's Board
 of Commissioners for 404.
 Commander-in-chief (The) a subordinate,
 92.
 — (A) unfit to counsel a
 British Cabinet, 95.
 "Complete (Roman) Catholic Directory,
 Almanac, and Registry," 411.
 Confirmation, 181.
 —, Every one an infidel before
 181.
 Conformity, Orthodoxy secured by 370.
 Con O'Nial, The Bishop of Mentz to him,
 416.
 Conservative Roman Catholic, A, 85.
 Constitutional privileges gained by Protes-
 tantism, 77.
 Convention, Both houses of 96.
 Convictions of the people, The Reformation
 grew out of 80.
 Corruption of the Church foretold, 259.
 Corruption (State) a cause of division in
 the church, 372.
 Council of Trent affords an interpretation of
 Scripture, 155.
 Cranmer, 270, 329.
 Cranmer, Writ for the *auto da fe* on 253.
 Creation of a sound public opinion, 398.
 Creed of Pope Pius IV., 147, 159, 161, 289.
 — its "Novelty" 157.
 — only a condensation
 of errors previously existing, 159.
 Crete, Titus, Bishop of 194.
 Criminality of praying to saints, 245.
 Cromwell, 83.
 — let him have a statue, 84.
 Cunningham, General 179.
 Curious advertisement, A, 233.
 "Cup-tosser, The" 300.
 D.
 Daniel O'Connell, 80, 172.
 "Daniel O'Slash," 87.
 David's troubles from ungodly generals,
 90.
 Deacons, Form of their ordering 371.
 Debate (A late) in Parliament, displaying
 specimens of infatuation, weakness, folly,
 pusillanimity, and blind compromise of
 principle on the Maynooth grant, 71.
 — Extraordinary in Parliament, 66.
 Debate (Irish) in 1792, 179.
 Declaration of William and Mary, 100.
 "Degradation of its votaries," a mark of the
 Apostasy, 254.
 Denis Browne, Hon. 178.
 Dens, 176.
 Denial of Christ (Virtual), a mark of the
 Apostasy, 256.
 Description of the Church of Christ, 185.
 Despatches of the Duke of Wellington,
 87.
 "Development of Christian doctrine," by
 Newman, 316.
 Devotion in honour of "St. Philomene,"
 243.
 Dickens, Mr. Charles 245, 347, 358.
 Didactic Acts of Parliament, Precedent for
 386.
 Didactic proclamation exemplified, 384.
 Difference (Fundamental) between the An-
 glican and Roman churches, 148.
 Discussion with Maguire, Extracts from it
 157.
 Discussion, Roman Catholic boastings be-
 fore the 412.
 Disease, Sin pourtrayed under the idea of
 69.
 Disqualified (Papists) for freedom, 82.
 Dissent, Admission of lay helps in the
 church would dry up the springs of 339.
 Dissent, Separation from Rome no warrant
 for 409.
 Dissenters (Some) teach a lesson to Church-
 men, 342.

Disunion from want of brotherly love, 376.
Divines (The greatest) view Popery as the Apostasy, 8.

Division (Internal) from three sources, 365.

Divisions, Extrinsic and intrinsic 328.

Divisions (Intrinsic) of the church, 364.

Division, Want of brotherly love, a cause of 376.

Dogma of the Duke of Wellington, 86.

Don Francis de Lucia, 235, 238.

Downfall of Father Maguire, and a peculiarity in effecting it, 12.

Dublin policemen, Rule for 52.

Dublin Protestant Association, 377.

Duke of Wellington, 3, 68, 86.

_____ and the Bishop of London, 91.

Duration of the Apostasy, 268.

Duties of a primitive bishop, 194.

Duty of Christians to sanctify the State, 122.

_____ of plain speaking, 116.

E.

Earl of Lincoln, 72.

"Earthly magnificence," 236.

East, Simultaneous with the fulness of the Apostasy is the false prophet of the 257.

Ecolampadius, 273.

Edward, Reigns of Elizabeth and 30.

_____ VI., 107.

Effeminacy of the age only removable by increased liberty and power in the church, 346.

England and Rome in moral opposition, 106.

_____, Protestant 28.

_____, Public spirit in 39.

_____, The Reformation in 29.

_____, Why is she prosperous? 32.

English History perverted by Papists, 101.

_____ people, Independence of the 27.

_____ character, Nationality of the 297.

_____ character, noble and generous, 298.

_____ disposition inclined to the solid,

299.

_____ Reformers' testimony against Rome,

270.

Episcopacy, Principle of 195.

Episcopal church, Scottish, 321.

"Epistle," Saint Peter's "First 227.

_____ St. Jude's, 228.

"Epistles" of St. Paul, 148.

"Epistle to the Romans," 149.

"_____ (Second) to the Thessalonians," chap. ii., 229.

"Epistles," St. Paul's 247.

"Epitaph" of "St. Philomene," 238.

Error (The) of the Tractarians, 225.

Evangelical Alliance, 340.

Evening Mail not the organ of the Protestants, 58.

_____, its rancorous spirit, 60.

_____, utterly powerless in Dublin, 61.

_____, Extract from the 68.

Evening Mail, far behind the Protestant mind, 66.

Events, Popery likely to be elucidated by 275.

Evils in the church, 342.

_____, remedy in their removal, 343.

Exact conformity with the doctrine and tone of the church promotive of unity, 367.

Excuse for schism, Restrictions on Christian liberty 332.

Explained, Romish texts from Scripture 140.

Extraordinary joke of Dr. Todd, 288.

F

Faber's "Calendar of Prophecy," 159.

Faber, Rev. George Stanley 268, 289.

Factory labour, Her Majesty's Board of Commissioners for the regulation of 406.

Faith alone, Justification by 149.

_____, justification by, 249.

_____, Natural and supernatural 356.

_____, The Tractarians opposed to justification by 137.

Falsehood, (Prevalence of) degrades society, 121.

False brethren guarded against by the church, 371.

_____ doctrine a cause of division, 365.

_____ remedied by respect for the church's standard, 370.

_____ prophet of the East simultaneous with the Apostasy, 257.

"Fanatics" (Troops of) wanted for Ireland, 6.

Fear of Papists not our actuating principle, 176.

"First Epistle" of Saint Peter, 227.

Fitzralph of Dundalk, 328.

Fitz-Ralph, Richard 209.

Flint, John 54.

Folly of forgetting God, 360.

Foreign reformers' testimony against Rome, 273.

Fragment of an extraordinary debate in Parliament, 66.

Freedom, Results of Protestantism on British 107.

_____, Papists disqualified for it, 82.

Fundamental difference between the Anglican and Romish churches, 148.

Future priests (The) from Maynooth, 153.

G

Galway, Warden of 13.

Genius of Christianity mistaken by Tractarians, 225.

Gentry, Power of the Irish Protestant 392.

Genuine doctrine of the church evangelical, 365.

Gifts, Laymen sometimes possess 336.

Glance at "a great idea," 403.

Glory of the present epoch, 168.
 Glorious work (A) before us, 85.
 God not without witnesses, 261.
 — speaks by Providence, 15.
 God's Word the only weapon for the fight
 against Popery, 12.
 Gospel (The) foolishness to men, 145
 — wiser than men, 146.
 Goulbourn, Mr. 72.
 Graham's (Sir James) "enlightened" notions
 on celibacy, 390.
 Grattan, Henry 178.
 Great Apostasy, Prophecy of a 228.
 — Apostasy, Popery should be attacked
 as the 124.
 — foretold Apostasy, Popery is the 230.
 Great point of St. Paul, 148.

H

"Hem of the Garment," by Dr. Hook, 347.
 Heretical sects, 322.
 "History of England," Lingard's 101.
 History perverted by Papists, 101.
 "Homily of Obedience," 266.
 — again at Peril of Idolatry," 269.
 — on Reading the Holy Scriptures,"
 188.
 Hook, Dr. 223, 347.
 Hooper, 271.
 Horrible-occurrence, 46.
 How a sinner is justified by faith, 131.
 How Popery is to be eradicated, 123.
 "How shall a man be just before God?"
 Rome's solution of it, 129.

I

Idolatry, A priest's explanation of it, 156.
 Illustrations of popular Irish poetry, 304.
 Images, Letter of the council sent to the
 Archbishop of Canterbury for the destruc-
 tion of 388.
 Importance of unity in the church, 233.
 Impracticable, how to make Repeal so 5.
 Independence of the English people, 27.
 Independents' theory, 196.
 Indifference to religion the character of the
 times, 345.
 Iniquity, The mystery of 250.
 Injustice to Protestant policemen in Dublin,
 52.
 Internal divisions of the Church from three
 sources, 365.
 Interpretation, Protestant and Popish 236.
 Introduction, 1.
 Italy, 46.
 Ireland, Apathy in 41:
 — essentially degraded by Popery, 300.
 — is enslaved, 121.
 —, "Songs" of 302.
 —, Popery degrades 313.
 —, Protestantism in 31.
 —, Protestant operatives of 35.
 — should be made a country for Irish-
 men, 206.

Ireland the last stronghold of Popery, 416.
 — the sinews of the Protestant cause,
 the Protestant masses of 380.
 — the proper arena for Irishmen, 296.
 — "The Library" of 301.
 Irish debate in 1792, 179.
 Irishmen in England, 9.
 Irish priests, Resolutions of some 125.
 — Protestant gentry, Power of the 392.
 — Protestants begin to be governed by
 principle, 32.
 — Protestants' work, 122.
 — Roman Catholics are Wauchobites,
 327.
 — (The) in Sheffield, 9.
 — (The) reformation did not grow out of
 the convictions of the people, 31.
 — works necessary for Irish minds, 262.

J

Joke (Extraordinary) of Dr. Todd, 286.
 Justification by faith, 248.
 — alone, 149.
 — The Tractarians op-
 posed to 137.
 — by works, 249.
 —, Newman on 150.
 —, Tendency of the Romish doc-
 trine of 134.

K

King William's motto, 4, 100.
 Kirk's (The) reply to Mary Queen of Scots,
 112.
 Knox, John 110, 329.

L

Langrishe, Sir Hercules 177.
Latetinos, 254.
 Latimer, 270, 329.
 Lay-gifts, Wesleyan policy as to 337.
 Lay helps in the church, Admission of 336.
 — would dry up the
 springs of dissent, 339.
 Laymen sometimes possess gifts, 336.
 Lectures of Dr. Todd, The Donellan 265.
 Leeds, Vicar of 223.
 —, Visit of the Author to 223.
 Letter to Rev. J. H. Newman, 37.
 Letter of the council sent to the Archbishop
 of Canterbury for the destruction of
 images, 388.
 Liberty, British 36.
 Liberty the excuse for schism, Restriction on
 Christian 339.
 "Library of Ireland," 301.
 "Life and adventures" of "St. Philomene,"
 238.
 Lieburn's "History of England," 101.
 Lieburn, The march at 34.
 Litany of "St. Philomene," 243.
 Lollards, The 29.
 Lord Lieutenant, Memorial to the 54.
 —, reply of the 57.

Luther, 29, 272, 329, 365.
 "Lying Legends," 253.

M.

Macaulay, 71.
 Mahomet, 160.
 Maitland, Rev. Rossey 118, 266.
 Maldonatus, 176.
 Manchester (Picture of) under radical reform, 394.
 Manners, Lord John 72.
 March at Lisburn, 34.
 Marks of the Apostasy, 246, 253.
 ——— a Christian church, 186.
 ——— The Anglican Church possesses them, 189.
 "Martyrdom" of "St. Philomene," 240.
 Mass in Austria, Imposing sacrifice of the 401.
 Massillon, 254.
 Mary of Orange, Prince William and the Princess, 96.
 Mary, Queen 107.
 ——— of Scots, Remonstrances to 110.
 ——— Reply of 111.
 ——— The kirk's reply to 112.
 Mathematical line (A) divides truth from error, 150.
 Mathew, Father 28.
 ——— his "Sobriety" 47.
 Maynooth grant, Oastler's opinion of the 62.
 ———, M'Ghee's objections to the increased grant to 162.
 Mede, Joseph 268.
 Melancthon, 273, 329.
 Memorial to the Lord Lieutenant, 54.
 Men of peace should compose the British Cabinet, 89.
 M'Ghee (Mr.) answered by a supposed priest, 154.
 ——— objections to the increased grant to Maynooth, 162.
 ———, Rev. R. J. 154.
 M'Hale, Dr. 92.
 Middle ages, Tractarians glory in the 77.
 Military philosopher, Wellington a 87.
 Milton to the Protestants of his age, 81.
 Minister of God, Science supplies wings to 169.
 Mission of Christians, 45.
 Monks (The) how the nursing parents of the arts, 77.
 Moral resources in the church neglected, 363.
 "Morgan O'Slash," 67.
 Motto of King William III. 4, 100.
 M. J. O'Connell, 74.
 M'Neile's (Rev. Hugh) opinion on the Act of Uniformity, 339.
 Multiplicity of churches, 814.
 ——— sects a judgment, 341.
 Murphy, Sergeant 72.

Murray, Dr. 92.
 Musculus, 272.
 Mystery of iniquity, The 250.

N.

Napoleon and Wellington, 87.
 National law commands the eradication of Popery, 363.
 National Prosperity a divine gift, 368.
 Nationality of the English character, 297.
 Natural and supernatural faith, 356.
 Nature and origin of the Author's opposition to Popery, 170.
 Newman, Rev. J. H. 37, 316.
 ———, his haughty and hypocritical reply to the Author's letter, 38.
 ———, Letter to him, 37.
 ———, on Justification, 150.
 ———, Second letter of the Author to 38.
 Newry, Vicar of 17.
 Non-interference with politics antagonistic to the spirit of the British constitution, 87.
 "Number 666," 254.
 Numbers not strength, 70.

O

Oastler's opinion of the Maynooth grant, 62.
 Objections met, Personal 7.
 Objections to the increased grant to Maynooth, by M'Ghee, 162.
 Objection (The true) to the Roman Catholic Church, 147.
 Occurrence, Horrible 46.
 O'Connell, Daniel 80, 172.
 ———, his apostrophe, 85.
 ———, his real object, 86.
 ———, M. J. 74.
 Oliver Goldsmith, 23.
 Open air preaching, 843.
 Operatives of Ireland, Protestant 35.
 Opinion, Public and private 286.
 Orange, Prince William and Princess Mary of 96.
 Organisation necessary to gain our point, 408.
 Orthodoxy secured by conformity, 370.
 Orthodox *Status* of the Author, 18.
 O'Sullivan's (Dr.) system, 289.

P

Paine, Tom 26, 332.
 Papists and Protestants, their relative positions, 169.
 Papists disqualified for freedom, 82.
 Papists (Fear of) not an actuating principle, 176.
 Papists should act as papists, 86.
 Patrick, Saint 197.
 Paul, "Epistles" of Saint 148, 247.
 Peel, Sir Robert 3.
 ———, Sir Rotten 67.
 People, Christian rulers servants of the 75.
 ——— (The) and their rulers, 117.

- Personal Objections met, 7.
 Peter's (Saint) "First Epistle" 227.
 "Philomene," Saint 232, 243.
 "Philomene," "Epitaph" of 238.
 ———, "Life and Adventures" of 238.
 ———, "Relics" of Saint 241.
 ———, her "martyrdom," 240.
 Philosophers may prefer Popery, 26.
 Philosopher, Wellington a military 87.
 Phocas the Emperor, 260.
 Picture of Manchester under radical reform, 394.
 Pius IV., Creed of 159, 147, 161, 259.
 Plain speaking, Scottish, 114.
 ———, Duty of, 116.
 ———, The Author often reproved for, 116.
 Policemen, Rule for Dublin, 52.
 Policy (Present State) subversive of morality, 393.
 Political problem (The) to be solved is to change the spirit of the times, 410.
 Politics, what they are, 44.
 Pope Pius IV., Novelty of his Creed, 157.
 ———, his addition to the Nicene Creed, 157.
 Pope, Rev. R. S. P. 11.
 ——— (The) is Antichrist, 118.
 ———, that he is Antichrist, should be unflinchingly maintained, 119.
 Popery, "A great idea" from it 402.
 ———, a philosophical system, 26.
 ———, Characteristics of 78.
 ———, degrades Ireland, 312.
 ———, degrades society, 121.
 ———, Ireland essentially degraded by 300.
 ——— is bondage, The spirit of, 85.
 ——— is the great foretold Apostasy, 230.
 ——— likely to be elucidated by events, 275.
 ———, Nature and origin of the Author's opposition to it, 170.
 ———, Philosophers may prefer, 26.
 ———, its quietude, 47.
 ——— should be attacked as the Great Apostasy, 124.
 ——— (Word of God) the only weapon for the fight against it, 12.
 ——— worked out in popish countries, 47.
 Popish Austria, 27.
 Positions (Relative) of Papists and Protestants, 169.
 Post reformational churches, 319.
 Poverty, Vows of 253.
 Power of the Irish Protestant gentry, 392.
 Powerlessness of the sovereign for tyranny, 74.
 Practicability, what it is, 3.
 Praying to saints, Criminality of it, 245.
 Preaching in the open air, 343.
 Precedent for didactic Acts of Parliament, 386.
 Present epoch, Glory of it, 168.
 Present State policy subversive of morality, 393.
 Presumption of Dr. Todd, 281.
 Prevalence of falsehood degrades society, 121.
 ——— truth exalts society, 120.
 Prevalent common sense the consequence of prevailing truth, 312.
 Priest's (A) explanation of idolatry, 156.
 ——— Reply to the Author, 137.
 ——— to the proposal for reconciliation, 127.
 Priests, Resolutions of some Irish 125.
 Principle of Episcopacy, 195.
 "Privacy of entrance, and identification in nature of Popery, with the apostasy of ancient Israel," 255.
 Processional principle, 352.
 Property of the church equitably held, 24.
 Property of the church not public, 362.
 Prophecy of a great Apostasy, 228.
 ——— supplies the means for meeting the papists, 263.
 Prophetic notation, 264.
 Prosperity (National) a Divine gift, 358.
 Prosperous, Why England is, 32.
 Protestant Association (The) 79, 176.
 Protestant Association of Dublin, 377.
 Public and private opinion, 236.
 Public feeling neglects not the worthless, 51.
 Public-spirited, Roman Catholics seem 80.
 Public spirit in England, 39.
 Public (The) entitled to be consulted on matters of public interest, 378.
 Pulpit (The) the proper arena for the minister, 22.
 "Purgatory," 257.

Q

 Queen Caroline, 51.
 ——— Elizabeth, 108.
 ——— Mary, 107.
 ——— (The) reads the newspapers, 398.
 Quietude of Popery, 47.

R

 Radical reform, We want 392.
 Real object of O'Connell, 85.
 Real radical reform a wholesome agitation, 396.
 Reason and revelation, 183.
 Redington, Mr. 73.
 Reform or the State the proper remedy, 374.
 Reformation, Dr. Todd brings into contempt the, 278.
 Reformation, Testimony against Rome before the, 272.
 Reformation (The) in Ireland did not grow out of the convictions of the people, 31.
 Reformation (The) in England, 29.
 ——— grew out of the convictions of the people, 30.
 Reformed churches, 318.
 Reformers' (English) testimony against Rome, 270.

- Reformers' (Foreign) testimony against Rome, 278.
 Reigns of Edward and Elizabeth, 80.
 Religion, Indifference to it, the character of the times, 346.
 —, What it consists in, 182.
 Religious instruction of the Irish in their native language, Her Majesty's Board of Commissioners for, 407.
 Remarkable circumstance at first concessions to Popery, 180.
 Remonstrance to Mary Queen of Scots, 110.
 Repeal Association, 80.
 —, how to make it impracticable, 5.
 —, impracticable, What alone can make 5.
 — movement, 4.
 — of the Union, 3.
 Reply to Mary Queen of Scots, 111.
 — of the Kirk to Mary Queen of Scots, 112.
 — of the Lord Lieutenant to the memorialists, 57.
 — (Priest's) to the Author 137.
 — (Second) of the Author, 138.
 — to the priests' proposal for reconciliation, 127.
 Resolutions of some Irish priests, 125.
 Resources (Moral) in the church neglected, 383.
 Restrictions on Christian liberty the excuse for schism, 332.
 Results of Protestantism on British freedom, 107.
 Revelation and reason, 183.
 "Revival of Paganism," 254.
 Revolution of 1688, 101.
 Roman Catholic and Protestant churches, 124.
 Roman Catholic boastings before the discussion, 412.
 — — — — — silenced by the discussion, 414.
 — — — church, The true objection to the, 147.
 — Catholics seem public-spirited, 80.
 — — —, Controversy with 293.
 — churches, Fundamental difference between the Anglican and, 148.
 — church (The) has a *sense* of Scripture, 155.
 — — — originally pure, 291.
 "Romans, Epistle to the," 149.
 Rome and England in moral opposition, 106.
 —, English reformers' testimony against 270.
 —, Foreign reformers' testimony against 273.
 —, Seat or see of the Apostasy is, 258.
 —, Testimony before the Reformation against, 272.
 —, Testimony of the church against, 266.
 —, The tide of truth is flowing in upon, 168.
 Rome's solution of "How shall a man be just before God?" 129.
 Romish doctrine of justification, its tendency 134.
 — quotations from Scripture explained, 140.
 Rulers, (Christian) servants of the people, 75.
 —, The people and their 117.
 S
 St. Nicholas Within, 15.
 "Saint worship," 253.
 — — — criminal, 246.
 Saying of St. Augustine's, 143.
 Schism, Restrictions on Christian liberty, the excuse for 332.
 Schismatical sects 321.
 — — — and heretical sects, 323.
 Scottish Episcopal Church, 321.
 Scottish plain speaking, 114.
 Scripture, The Roman Church has a *sense* of 156.
 Scripture, Unity inculcated by it—285.
 "Second Epistle to the Thessalonians," chap. ii., 229.
 Sects, 321.
 —, Heretical 322.
 —, Schismatical 321.
 —, Schismatical and heretical, 323.
 — a judgment, Multiplicity of 341.
 Servants of the people, Christian rulers are the 75.
 Shaw, Mr. 72.
 Sheffield, Social feeling in 49.
 —, The Irish in 9.
 Sheil, Mr. 74, 172.
 Sin portrayed under the idea of disease, 69.
 Singularity of opinion unprofitable in controversy with Roman Catholics, 293.
 Simultaneous with the Apostasy is the false prophet of the East, 257.
 Sir C. Napier, 71.
 Sir Hercules Langrishe, 177.
 Sir James Graham's "enlightened" notions on celibacy, 393.
 Sir R. Peel's parliamentary tactics, Mystery is the characteristic of 94.
 "Sir Rotten Peel," 67.
 Slanders of enemies, 8.
 "Sobriety of Father Mathew," 47.
 Social feeling in Sheffield, 49.
 Society degraded by Popery, 121.
 Society, Prevalence of falsehood degrades 121.
 Society exalted by the Prevalence of truth, 120.
 Soldiers, The *Tablet* to 98.
 Some dissenters irregular only, not heterodox, 325.
 "Songs of Ireland," 302.
 Specimens of infatuation, weakness, folly, pusillanimity, and blind compromise of principle, from a late debate in Parliament on the Maynooth grant, 71.
 Spirit (The) of Popery is bondage, 85.

- State corruption a cause of division in the church, 372.
 State (Reform of the) the proper remedy, 374.
 State (The) attempts what it cannot do, 400.
 — neglects what it alone can do, 400.
 State policy (Present) subversive of morality, 393.
 Status of the Church of Ireland, 221.
 — of the Author is Orthodox, 18.
 —, Peculiarity of the Author's ecclesiastical 18.
 Steam-engine, &c., Protestantism in it 120.
 Submission of the people in Austria, 27.
 Supernatural faith, Natural and 356.
 — paramount, 367.
- T.
- Tablet to soldiers, 93.
 Tactics, Mystery the characteristic of Sir B. Peel's parliamentary 94.
 Tendency of the Romish doctrine of justification, 184.
 Testimony (We want), not persecution, 282.
 Testimony of the Church against Rome, 269.
 — against Rome
 before the Reformation, 272.
 — English Reformers against
 Rome, 270.
 — Foreign Reformers against
 Rome, 273.
 Theory of the Independents, 195.
 Thirty-nine Articles (The) novel in form only 158.
 Tide of truth (The) is flowing in upon Rome, 168.
 Todd, Dr. 118, 266.
 —, absurdity of his reasoning, 280.
 — abundantly sophistical, 279.
 — ought to be learned, 287.
 — brings the Reformation into contempt, 278.
 —, Extraordinary joke of 288.
 — knowingly against the church, 274.
 — opposes the Catholic or universal opinion of his church, 277.
 —, The Donnellan lectures of 285.
 —, The presumption of 281.
 — Views of 267.
- Tractarianism, 251.
 Tractarians glory in the middle ages, 77.
 — mistake the genius of Christianity, 225.
 — (The) 76, 137.
 — by faith, 137.
 —, their error, 225.
 Traditions of the church, 192.
 Trent, Council of 155.
- Treves, "Holy coat" of, 83.
 Troops of "Fanatics" wanted for Ireland, 6.
 True and false articles placed in juxtaposition, 168.
 True (The) objection to the Roman Catholic Church, 147.
 Truth exalts society, Prevalence of 120.
 Truth (The) should always be spoken, 109.
 Tyranny practised over Protestants, 56.
- U.
- Ultra-Protestantism, 43.
 Uniformity, Act of 385.
 —, Rev. Hugh M'Neile's opinion on it, 339.
 Union, Repeal of the 3.
 Union with a godless state corrupts the church, 373.
 Unity inculcated by Scripture, 285.
 Unity in the church, Importance of 283.
 University Magazine for Oct. 1841, 124.
 "Universal prevalence," 253.
- V.
- Vicar of Leeds, 223.
 — Newry, 17.
 Views of Dr. Todd, 267.
 "Virtual denial of Christ," 256.
Vis consili expers mole ruit sua, 90.
 Visit of the Author to Leeds, 223.
 Voice of Providence, 17.
 Voltaire, 26.
 "Vows of poverty," 253.
- W.
- Waldenses, The 161, 272.
 Waterloo, 88.
 Wauchobites, Irish Roman Catholics are 327.
 "We are seven millions," 18.
 We have Bishops in Parliament, 398.
 We want radical reform, 392.
 We want testimony, not persecution, 389.
 Wellington and Napoleon, 89.
 —, The Duke of 3, 69, 86.
 — and the Bishop of London, 91.
 Wellington has nearly unchristianised the British State, 91.
 —, a military philosopher, 87.
 —'s despatches, 87.
 Wellington his dogma, 86.
 Wesley might perhaps have been more useful in the church, 19.
 Wesleyan policy as to lay gifts, 337.
 What alone can make repeal impracticable, 5.
 Whately, Dr. 8, 10, 15, 26.
 Whence the interests of society might be promoted, 354.
 Why England is prosperous, 32.
 "Woe is me, if I preach not the Gospel!" 19.

- Woe is me, if I run without being sent !"**
 19.
Wood, Col. T. 71.
Word of God the only weapon for the fight
 against Popery, 12.
Working classes, Her Majesty's Board of
Commissioners for regulating and improv-
ing the condition of the 403.
Works, (Irish) necessary for Irish minds,
 262.
- Works, Justification by** 249.
Work of Irish Protestants, 122.
Writ for the *auto da fe* on Cranmer, 253.
- Y.
Young, Dr. 255.
- Z.
Zuinglius, 273, 365.

ERRATA.

Page 12, line 30, *dele* "not."

Page 15, line 43, *for* "political" *read* "episcopal."

Page 90, line 28, *for* "Jeruiah" *read* "Zeruiah."

Page 202, line 5, *for* "fraternity" *read* "paternity."

Page 248, line 30, *supply* "and" *before* "embraces."

Page 252, line 38, *for* "view" *read* "few."

A FINE IS INCURRED IF THIS BOOK IS
NOT RETURNED TO THE LIBRARY ON
OR BEFORE THE LAST DATE STAMPED
BELOW.

36
SEP 7 1909
CANCELLED
NOV 7 1909

